

Library of

Wellesley



College.

Purchased from
Sweet Fund.

No 57387

THE EXPOSITOR

VOLUME X

List of Contributors to Volume X.

- REV. PROFESSOR B. W. BACON, D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR W. E. BARNES, D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR J. AGAR BEET, D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR W. H. BENNETT, D.D., LITT.D.
REV. ARTHUR CARR, M.A.
LATE REV. PROFESSOR SAMUEL IVES CURTISS, D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR S. R. DRIVER, D.D.
REV. ALEX. R. EAGAR, D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR G. G. FINDLAY, D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR A. E. GARVIE, M.A., D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR BUCHANAN GRAY, D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR H. R. MACKINTOSH, Ph.D.
REV. J. H. DUDLEY MATTHEWS, M.A.
REV. PROFESSOR D. S. MARGOLIOUTH, M.A.
REV. J. B. MAYOR, M.A., LITT.D.
REV. J. B. McCLELLAN, M.A.
REV. JAMES MOFFATT, D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR J. H. MOULTON, M.A., LITT.D.
PROFESSOR W. M. RAMSAY, D.C.L., LL.D.

THE
EXPOSITOR.

EDITED BY THE REV.

W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D.

SIXTH SERIES

Volume X

London:
HODDER AND STOUGHTON,
27, PATERNOSTER ROW.

—
MCMIV.

57387

BUTLER & TANNER,
THE SELWOOD PRINTING WORKS,
FROME, AND LONDON.

E 1

Y. 10

THE "COMING ONE" OF JOHN THE BAPTIST.

EVEN those disciples of the Baptist who, when Paul came to Ephesus (Acts xviii. 24-xix. 7), still maintained their separate communal existence unabsorbed by the Church, agreed with the Christians that their master, John, had predicted One "which should come after him." When Paul succeeded in persuading them that this could refer to no other than Jesus they submitted to a second baptism; for as regards the distinctive feature of the Christian rite, the giving of the Holy Spirit, they professed, in manifest sincerity, "not so much as to have heard of it."

Whenever the Church learns to appreciate the value of *differences* in the record, instead of hastening to obliterate discrepancies in the supposed interest of the doctrine of inspiration, it will be perceived that we have here a representation quite widely divergent from that given elsewhere, and *correspondingly instructive*. For Mark i. 7, 8 presents the Baptist as proclaiming nothing else than just the coming baptism of the Holy Spirit, while in John i. 19-37, iii. 22-30 the Baptist, in addition to this proclamation, persistently and consistently follows his God-given mission of "making manifest to Israel" "Him that baptizeth with the Holy Spirit." And this individual is not only specifically and repeatedly pointed out, but the whole "witness of John" consists of nothing else than pointing out Jesus publicly and to all as the "Bridegroom," "the Son of God," and more particularly the "Lamb of God" whose blood avails to "take away the sin of the world." John's own baptism

thus becomes a mere prefiguration of this only real and effective purification. Of a "baptism of repentance unto remission of sins" nothing remains. John comes only to point to the Atoning Lamb, and to symbolize by a type the coming baptism of the Spirit. Here is certainly a difference.

Criticism has in our time so far prevailed against harmonistics as to secure a very widespread admission that John i. 19-37, iii. 22-30 represents not so much history as doctrine; the significance put by the Church of A.D. 100 upon the mission and institution of the Baptist in relation to its own Christology, its own rite of Baptism, and its own doctrine of Atonement. Matthew iii. 1-12=Luke iii. 1-17, and the utterances of Jesus Himself as to the Baptist and his work are admitted to present a more historical view. It remains to make use of the fact of diversity in such a way as to draw the maximum of instruction from both forms, the more historical, and the doctrinally idealized as well.

We may defer for the present the attempt to obtain a reflex light on ideas and conditions of the Church in A.D. 100 from the change in point of view exhibited by the later documents, and confine ourselves to the simpler problem of the actual message and meaning of the Baptist in A.D. 28, assuming that the coincident testimony of the witnesses admitted to be earliest, especially when recording the utterances of Jesus Himself,¹ is to be preferred.

All our sources agree that the Baptist not only warned of a judgment to come in the general vein of prophetic exhortation, but in particular of "One that should come after him," who is not Jehovah Himself, though He executes the sentence of Jehovah; for it is inconceivable that the

¹ It is a well known fact that the Synoptists exhibit a minimum of divergence in recording the logia of Jesus. The reason is admitted to be superior care and reverence for this element of the tradition.

Baptist should compare himself to Jehovah as unworthy to "bear (or loose) His sandals"; and equally inconceivable that he should send to inquire of Jesus, "Art Thou the Coming One" (Matt. xi. 3 = Luke vii. 19) with such an understanding. The Christian Church from the beginning has assumed that by this Coming One he meant the Messiah. In fact, two at least of our Evangelists, as we have seen, assume that he meant Jesus individually. All the Synoptists alter the words "paths of our God" in the passage from Isaiah xl. 3, "Prepare the way of the Lord, make straight the paths of our God," into "*His* paths" in the interest of this specific application. Modern critics do not admit this meaning, but they go no further than to say, The Baptist is not speaking of Jesus individually, but of the expected Messiah. But if he meant the Christ, why did he not say so? Whence this new term "the Coming One" which reappears in varied form as "He that cometh behind me" or "after me"?¹ Why not ask, Art Thou the Christ? Moreover (1) there is little in the Baptist's representation of the Coming One to suggest the Son of David, the Horn of Salvation, the Redeemer and King of Israel, since not more than one of His accepted functions is dwelt upon, viz., the judgment.² (2) The Baptist's question,³ although presented in presence of the multitude, does not seem to suggest to the bystanders, friendly or hostile, any notion of Jesus' being the Christ. That He is such is still a secret from the public when revealed to Peter,⁴ "not by

¹ In Matt. xi. 3 = Luke vii. 19 we have simply *ὁ ἐρχόμενος*; in Matt. iii. 11 *ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἰσχυρότερός μου*, slightly varied in Mark i. 7 = Luke iii. 16. In John i. 15, 27, 30 *ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος*. In Acts xiii. 25, xix. 4 the *ὀπίσω* omitted in Luke iii. 16 is restored in the form of *μετά*. But cf. Heb. x. 37 with Hab. ii. 3, Mal. iii. 1 f.

² Cf. Matt. iii. 7-12 = Luke iii. 7-17, and see below on the intrusion of the words *πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ* Matt. iii. 11 = Luke iii. 16 from the logion of Jesus, Mark i. 8 = Acts i. 5, xi. 16.

³ Matt. xi. 3 = Luke vii. 19.

⁴ Matt. xvi. 13-20 and parallels.

flesh and blood," but by divine intuition. The later idea of our Evangelists, carrying back the public proclamation of Jesus' Messiahship to the very baptism itself, scarcely obscures the earlier representation derivable from Jesus' own words, and abundantly confirmed by the historical necessities of the case, that this declaration was reserved for the final entry into Jerusalem. The cry of the maniac of Khersa¹ is indeed generalized by Mark into a recognition by all the demons "whosoever they saw Him";² but this self-contradictory theory of our second Evangelist is repudiated by Matthew,³ and while we may well accord some weight to the indications of Messianic acclamation in Matthew ix. 27, xii. 23, and xv. 22 (cf. John vi. 14, 15), which in turn are studiously excluded by Mark,⁴ some discount must be made for the evidences of assimilation between Matthew ix. 27 and xx. 30, 31, and the influence on Matthew of the motive apparent in his attachment of the genealogy. As the net result it will still be apparent, notwithstanding a possible sporadic outcry by a maniac, or even a stray reference to "the Son of David," that Messianism in the stricter sense played no considerable part in Jesus' public career until the last journey from Jericho to Jerusalem; and this is not easy to reconcile with the idea that the Baptist had sent two of his disciples to put to Jesus publicly the question, "Art Thou *the Messiah* or no?" especially when the answer was, to say the least, not a negative.

Is it then conceivable that the Baptist had some other expected personage in mind, or at least some special aspect of the Messianic work which might be popularly understood as committed to another? Two lines of inquiry are open:

¹ Mark v. 7 and parallels.

² Mark iii. 11, cf. i. 24, 34b.

³ Cf. the omission of Mark i. 23-26, 34b and alteration of Mark iii. 11 in Matt. xii. 15, 16.

⁴ For the reason see Wrede, *Messiasgeheimniss*.

1. Current Messianic expectations as known from contemporary literature, and the Coming One, or Coming Ones, there delineated.

2. The portrait drawn by the Baptist's own reported utterances in Matthew iii. 7-12 and parallels, taken together with his seeming readiness to apply it to Jesus after "hearing the works of the Christ" in the prison.

(1) It is undeniable that the judgment, or separation of the wheat from the chaff, which constitutes the one activity of the Coming One in the Baptist's presentation, belongs with the primary elements in the Messianic programme of the popular faith. It is a stereotyped feature of current eschatology that the kingdom of God supervenes upon a time not only of darkest discouragement, and of cruel oppression by the Gentiles, but also of inward corruption and disorder, physical, social and moral.¹

The age of Messianic deliverance is promised indeed, and according to many authorities the time is already fulfilled; but the promise is conditioned on Israel's moral reformation and observance of the law. This antinomy between the fixed belief in the "falling away," and the moral conviction that the Messianic kingdom can be given only to a righteous people, forms the foundation of a doctrine of the *purification of Israel*. This is accomplished by (a) the Judgment.

Originally the judgment is coincident with the destruction of the hostile powers. The first victims are the renegade and unworthy Israelites. Later, when a Messianic kingdom under Yahweh's vicegerent is expected as preliminary to the ultimate "restoration of all things" (1 Cor. xv. 24), a first judgment by Messiah² (which also has its accompanying "first resurrection") is distinguished

¹ See Volz, *Jüdische Eschatologie*, 1903, § 31: "Die letzte böse Zeit."

² Messiah and his immediate supporters are of course the agents of this judgment; cf. Matt. xix. 28=Luke xxii. 29, 30 and 1 Cor. vi. 2.

from the last or general judgment of God Himself. But when no personal Messiah, and no preliminary millennial reign of the Son of David is anticipated—and this is the earlier and, on the whole, the commoner form of the Messianic hope—"the judgment" is of course the judgment of God Himself, whether executed in person, or through the agency of the Destroying Angel. Now the Baptist unquestionably means by the "stronger than he" the executioner of the judgment toward whom he himself occupies the relation of a mere warning voice.¹ We have also seen that his comparisons imply that its agent is not Yahweh in person, but some representative such that it becomes proper to speak of him as the Reaper of Yahweh's harvest.² But before we can reasonably infer that the Baptist's Reaper is "the Messiah" in the accepted sense, it would be needful to show that he held also that special form of the Messianic hope which conceived the restoration of all things as preceded by a millennial reign of the Son of David. Our only means of judging as to this is to observe what element it is of the preceding eschatological literature which gives the colour to his warning.

But first let it be observed that there is no more instructive feature of the exhaustive study of Jewish eschatology, just published by P. Volz,³ than the demonstration that in the Messianic hope the *agent* is secondary and variable, while the essential *transactions* are primary and constant. Thus in some of its forms the judgment even precedes the appearance of Messiah; and in many forms no definite personality distinguishable from Yahweh Himself appears

¹ Whether the comparison of John to the "Voice in the desert" of Isa. xl. 3 rests upon actual tradition, or is only the adaptation of Mark. i. 3 and parallels by the fourth Evangelist, must be left undetermined.

² With the figure "He shall gather the wheat into his garner, and shall burn up the chaff with fire unquenchable" compare the function of the "angels" in Matt. xiii. 30, 39-42.

³ *Jüdische Eschatologie*, 1903.

as ruler in the Messianic kingdom. In particular we are told regarding the special feature of the execution of even the Messianic judgment, that its agent is not always the Messiah Himself.

"What falls to Messiah to do is elsewhere committed to the agency of angels. The chief passage is *Assumptio Mosi* x. 2, where we see the Angel executing the vengeance of Israel on their enemies, cf. Dan. x. and *Test. Dan.* vi."¹

In fact *Ass. Mos.* belongs to the writings which conceive the Messianic redemption as the intervention of "God alone,"² though preceded by "the angel" who prepares His way.

It must accordingly be regarded as doubtful, to say the least, whether the recorded utterances of the Baptist suggest any other preliminary to the final dénouement of Yahweh's reign over all the earth than that very work of judgment and purification by fire which he conceives as committed to the hand of the great Reaper.³

(b) Popular eschatology in the Baptist's time had another and in some respects more notable solution of the antinomy between apocalyptic tradition and the moral consciousness. The necessary purification of Israel would be accomplished by "*the Great Repentance.*"

As to the various forms in which this doctrine appears in apocalyptic, pseudepigraphic, and Talmudic literature, we

¹ Volz, *op. cit.* § 38, 3b, p. 277.

² Cf. Isa. lxiii. 5.

³ If it be replied that Amos also rebuked the false confidence of Israel in "the Day of Yahweh" by declaring it to be "darkness and not light," a day of judgment against Yahweh's own unworthy people instead of the expected triumph over their enemies; and yet does not exclude the hope of ultimate triumph for the purified remnant, the comparison is fully justified. But even granting the very doubtful authenticity of Amos ix. 11-15, the parallel only requires that the Baptist looked for "new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness," after the day of burning, which by no means necessarily involves a millennial reign of the Son of David. The noteworthy fact is that he has nothing to say about the nature of the "kingdom," but only of the impending "wrath."

must refer to the recent works of Baldensperger¹ and Volz,² as well as the older standard treatises of Schürer,³ Weber,⁴ Bousset,⁵ and R. H. Charles.⁶ Schürer's concise statement may well be cited:—

"The return of the prophet Elijah to prepare the way of the Messiah was expected on the ground of Mal. iii. 23, 24 (Engl. iv. 5, 6). This view is already taken for granted in the Book of Ecclesiasticus (xlviii. 10, 11). It is, as is well known, frequently alluded to in the New Testament (see especially Matt. xvii. 10; Mark ix. 11; also Matt. xi. 14, xvi. 14; Mark vi. 15, viii. 28; Luke ix. 8, 19; John i. 21). It was even transferred to the Christian circle of ideas. According to Malachi iii. 24 (iv. 6), the object of his mission is chiefly considered to be to make peace upon earth, and in general to substitute order for disorder (Matt. xvii. 11: ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα; Mark ix 12: ἀποκαθιστάνει πάντα)."

Schürer next quotes from the Mishna (*Edujoth*, viii. 7) the passage already shown⁷ to be connected with Matthew xi. 12, 13 = Luke xvi. 16, and which, when taken with the other passages cited by Weber,⁸ is clearly seen to be a development of the doctrine of the ἀποκατάστασις along the lines of Ecclesiasticus xlviii. 11 (καταστήσαι φυλὰς Ἰακώβ).⁹ In other words, an understanding of the "purification" with reference to correct genealogy (cf. Neh.

¹ *Die messianisch-apokalyptischen Hoffnungen der Juden*, 1903. See especially p. 96 f.

² Ut supra, § 33, "Die besonderen Heilspersonen," pp. 190-196.

³ Engl. Trans. *The Jewish People in the Time of Christ*, 1891, § 29, "The Messianic Hope," II. ii. pp. 154-165. The subsequent German edition makes no change in the portion here considered.

⁴ *Altsynagogale Theol.* (also *Lehre d. Talmud*), § 77. "Elia der Vorläufer des Messias."

⁵ *Legend of Antichrist*, the chapter on "The Two Witnesses of Messiah" and *Commentar* on Rev. xi. 3 ff.

⁶ R. H. Charles is curiously silent on the doctrine of the Forerunners of Messiah and the Great Repentance, both in his *Eschatology*, etc., 1899, and elsewhere, but in the articles, "Apocalyptic Literature" in *Hastings, D.B.*, and especially Cheyne's *Enc. Bibl.*, the literature is carefully reviewed.

⁷ Bacon, *EXPOSITOR* for July, 1902, article "Elias and the Men of Violence."

⁸ Ut supra § 77, referring to *Edujoth*, i. 5 and *Kiddushin*, 17a.

⁹ A trait belonging to Yahweh's servant in Isa. xlix. 6.

xiii. 23-30, and Luke iii. 8b). Against this conception of Elijah's mission, as merely the external one of "restoring the tribes" by separating the true descendants of the patriarchs from the "bastards,"¹ the same passage of the Mishna records the protests of several rabbis, though the doctrine seems nevertheless to have ultimately prevailed. Thus "R. Jehudah says: only to admit, but not to reject" (from the kingdom). R. Simon held that Elijah's mission was "merely to *settle disputes*."

"The learned say his coming is 'neither to reject nor admit, but merely with the object of making peace in the world.' For it is said: 'I send you Elijah the prophet, to turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to the fathers' (Mal. iii. 24 [iv. 6])."

The protests are raised against a conception of the Elijan "purification" which seemed to make him usurp something of the Messianic prerogative of judgment. They point out that Elias' work is reformatory only, and in the case of the more liberal come almost to the point of the Gospel passage, in which John the Baptist figures as an Elias who does not reject, but welcomes the despised outcasts, the "sinners," and "people of the land," even at the expense of the self-righteous Pharisee.

Jealousy for the Messianic prerogative of judgment, however, raised no protest against the agreed point that Elias would settle all disputes; so that, as Schürer continues, "in the Mishna money and property whose owners are disputed, or anything found whose owner is unknown, must wait 'till Elijah comes'"; and 1 Macc. iv. 46 shows the antiquity of this idea. It remains side by side with a similar expectation of Messiah (John iv. 25). Even "the resurrection of the dead comes through the prophet Elijah," according to *Sota* ix. 15. Thus the line of delimitation

¹ טמזרים, i.e. the "people of the land," the "families who had entered by violence" (unlawfully) of *Edujoth*, and Matt. xi. 12, 13=Luke xvi. 16.

between "the Prophet like unto Moses" (Deut. xviii. 15), and his various forerunners, "Elias," "that prophet" (John i. 21-25), "Jeremias" (Matt. xvi. 14), the "two witnesses" Moses and Elias (Rev. xi. 3-13; Matt. xvii. 1-8 and parallels), or in extra canonical apocalypse and post-apostolic literature, "Enoch and Elias," is more or less ill-defined and vanishing. And this lack of precision, this multiplication of Messianic functionaries, is so far from a recent phenomenon that, on the contrary, it is obviously present in the very prophecy on which the expectations of Elijah and his work of purification and reform themselves are based. The last in order of our canonical prophets re-introduces the ancient figure of the "Angel of the Presence" of Exodus xxiii. 20-23, as the agent of the purification which must precede the great and terrible Day of Yahweh. In Malachi 1-3 he appears as the purifying "Messenger of the Covenant." If, conceivably, in the original intent this is no other than a theophany of Yahweh Himself, at least we know from Matthew xi. 10 and parallels that in New Testament times it was not so regarded; but the "Messenger," whose title has been transferred to the anonymous prophecy,¹ was, at least sometimes, identified with Elijah. His work is a purification of Israel by fire, and it "begins at the house of God."² "For he is like a refiner's fire and like fullers' lye; and he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver, and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver." Malachi in fact, like *Ass. Mos.*, presents no personal representative of Messiah. The Messianic hope appears only in iii. 20 [iv. 2], under the figure of the dawning of the "sun of righteousness" (Yahweh Himself, cf. 2 Sam. xxii. 4). The personal agents are simply forerunners, "Elijah," and the "Messenger of the Covenant." But are these viewed as two or one? It is

¹ Malachi = "my messenger." Cf. Mal. i. 1 with iii. 1.

² Cf. 1 Peter iv. 12-17.

hard to say, because the author's attention is confined to the supreme need of purification before the great Day of Yahweh; but certainly eschatological thought in New Testament times found room for both: Elias the Awakener, and the Angel of Purification by fire.

Whether, then, it be Malachi, or John the Baptist, whose personifications are to be interpreted, there is supreme need of the warning against indiscriminate identification with "the Messiah" so well expressed by Volz in the concluding paragraph of his section on the *dramatis personae* of the redemption:—

"The personages of the redemptive drama are therefore all in a sense Messiahs; the Prophet, Moses, Elijah, Enoch, the Angel, Enoch (Daniel, Ezra, Baruch) are the heroes of apocalypse, Moses is the hero of Judaism learned in the Law, Elijah apparently the hero of popular eschatology; the Prophet is the figure partaking most largely of earthly nature; the Angel the most transcendental. We see, accordingly, even before turning to the Messiah in the stricter sense, that *the Messianic idea is many-sided*, and that but little has been affirmed when we say, "Jesus regarded Himself as the Messiah." What kind of Messiah? As a prophet, or a teacher of the Torah, or the bearer of angelic power, as a priest-king (*Test. Levi*, 18), or finally as a politico-nationalistic king?"

Of one thing we may be sure. The more immediate popular expectation in the Baptist's time was that directed not to the Messiah Himself so much as to the *forerunner* of Messiah, coming to his work of purification. And the deeper the sense of Israel's unworthiness, the stronger the emphasis laid upon this indispensable preliminary. Hence the Twelve are no sooner made acquainted with Jesus' Messianic calling than they ask, "How then say the scribes that Elias must first come?" The Transfiguration scene and the reference of Jesus to John the Baptist (Mark ix. 2-10, *vv.* 11-13 and parallels) both deal in different ways with this doctrine of the "forerunners" or witnesses of Messiah.¹

¹ Bacon, *Am. Journ. of Theol.*, April 1902. "The Transfiguration Story."

In Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho*, xlix., the Jew sets in its true light both these references and the opening narratives of Mark and John by saying:—

"We all expect that Christ will be a man born of men, and that Elijah, when he comes, will anoint him.¹ But if this man [Jesus] appear to be Christ, he must certainly be known as man born of men; but from the fact that Elijah has not yet come, I infer that this man is not He." In chapter viii. Trypho even says, "But the Christ, if He has indeed been born, and exists anywhere, is unknown, and does not even know Himself [as Christ], and has no power, until Elias come to anoint Him, and make Him manifest to all" (cf. John i. 26-31; v. 35).

We need not, then, find it so surprising if, when attention is drawn to Jesus by His mighty works, and perhaps to some extent by the formal and public demand of the Baptist through two disciples sent to ask, "Art thou He that should come, or look we for another?" it nowhere seems to elicit a suggestion that Jesus may be the Christ, even if the Baptist so meant it; but only, "It is Elias," or "Jeremias,"² or "a prophet as one of the prophets." The superstitious popular rumour³ "John the Baptist is risen from the dead, and therefore do these miracles work in him" (Mark vi. 14 and 11) is based on the belief exemplified in Revelation xi. 3-13 and many later apocalypses, that the "forerunners" or "witnesses" of Messiah, Moses (Enoch) and Elias, are to work great miracles, culminating in resurrection from the dead, by which the false prophets of Antichrist are confuted, and "the great repentance" brought about.⁴

¹ Based on Zech. iv. 11-14; cf. Rev. xi. 3-6.

² On Jeremiah as a "forerunner" see Schürer, *ut supra*, p. 157, and Volz, p. 193; cf. also 2 Macc. xv. 13 ff., ii. 1 ff., and Bar. ix. 1.

³ The attributing of this to Herod in Mark vi. 16 is part of the highly legendary portrait of this cool-headed politician taken up by our second Evangelist from popular sources. It may rest upon a mistaken choice between the two readings current in the texts of verse 14, *ελεγον* and *ελεγεν*. Mark follows the latter (cf. v. 16). The former is historically correct.

⁴ Rev. xi. 13; cf. the authorities cited by Bousset, *Legend of Anti-Christ*, in the chapter on "The Two Witnesses." The *Repentance of James and Jambres* quoted in 2 Tim. iii. 8, seems to have dealt with the same conception.

The belief that Jesus is John the Baptist redivivus is therefore but another form of the rumour, "It is Elias."

(2) It is in the light of these current eschatological ideas that we must answer the question, Whom did John the Baptist mean? For the first principle of historical exegesis is that a prophet must be supposed to mean that which his language would most naturally convey to the hearers addressed.

If, then, we ask again the question, Who is the Stronger than the Baptist, who comes after him, winnowing-fan in hand, to burn up the chaff and gather the wheat in his garner? Is this the Messiah?—our answer must partake of the indefiniteness of the eschatology of the time. If by the Angel of the Covenant whose work of purification by fire forms the great theme of "Malachi" John understood "the Messiah," we need have no hesitation in answering Yes. For one need only place side by side the Baptist's imagery and "Malachi's"—the blazing stubble fields from which the broods of vipers flee hissing at harvest time (cf. Mal. iii. 20 [iv. 1] : "The day cometh, it burneth as a furnace; and all the proud and all that work wickedness shall be stubble"); the barren tree cut down and cast into the fire (cf. Mal. iii. 20 [iv. 1] : "The day that cometh shall burn them up, it shall leave them neither root nor branch"); the "Messenger of the Covenant" himself coming suddenly to his temple with a baptism of fire to purify the sons of Levi, as a refiner purges the dross from precious metals—to see whence the Baptist draws both content and form of his message. It is that of Malachi *without* the reference to the "healing" of the "Sun of Righteousness." *If* we may suppose that the Baptist understood by the Messenger of the Covenant and his purification by fire "the Messiah," then we may acquiesce in the current modern view, at least as regards his preaching in the wilderness. But from the foregoing it is clear that a truer answer would be. In

this warning of judgment the Baptist does not look beyond the purification itself. He does not define to himself who the Messenger of the Covenant may be; whether he is to be identified with Elijah, or with the Angel of the Presence, or with neither. He is simply the executioner of Yahweh's long-deferred wrath, the Reaper, the Purifier by flaming fire. And the "wrath to come" is now so near that it shuts out even the vision of the healing sunlight after the storm, save in the bare word "the kingdom is at hand."

We cannot even except John's alleged reference to the "baptism of the Holy Ghost." In Mark i. 8 this contrast between Christian baptism, with the fundamental significance of the gracious bestowal of the Spirit, and the Johannine lustration of repentance, is indeed put in the mouth of the Baptist himself, as who should say, "Repent, for judgment is just at hand; wash you from your sins, and seek forgiveness ere it be too late; for—there will shortly be a still more gracious opportunity of repentance!" But in Acts xi. 16 the genuine tradition still survives (altered in Acts i. 5 by the slight addition "not many days hence"), which rightly imputes this sublime promise to *Jesus*: "John indeed baptized in water, but ye shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit." It is one of the most unmistakable of the many evidences of the contamination of older *Logia* material in Matthew and Luke by the use of Mark, that Mark iii. 11 and Luke iii. 16 coincidentally conflate the genuine old tradition of the Baptist's warning: "I baptize with water, *but he shall baptize with fire,*" with the previous conflation of Mark i. 8. The result is a form which makes the ignorance of the Baptist's disciples in Ephesus¹ completely incredible, emasculates the sense, and only serves the interest of making John predict the Christian rite and the Pentecostal gift. The form: "I indeed baptize you with water, but

¹ Acts xix. 2.

he shall baptize you with *the Holy Ghost and fire*" is really tertiary.¹ Who that is aware of the facts can doubt, as he reads Matthew iii. 7-12=Luke iii. 6-17, that the Baptist, when he knew the "reasoning in men's hearts" as to his own personality, really brought back his hearers from this, to him, superficial digression by a warning contrast between the present "baptism of water unto repentance," and the impending purification by fire at the hand of "the Messenger of Yahweh"?²

But if in the Warning of Judgment the Baptist displays no definite conception of the personality of "him that should come after him," we must admit that there is less room for so pronouncing as regards the Message from Prison. *Primâ facie* we should take the Coming One of the Inquiry, Matthew xi. 3=Luke vii. 19, to be the same as the Great Reaper. Is it then conceivable that in this case also the Baptist is still thinking of "the Messenger of the Covenant"? Or, if not, of whom?

Even before we endeavour to solve this problem it will be apparent from the foregoing that in any event question and answer alike are more likely to have given rise among the bystanders to thoughts of Messiah's forerunners than of Messiah Himself: so that the rumours actually current at a later time, Matthew vi. 14-16, viii. 28 and parallels, are in fact one and all rumours of the appearance of the *forerunner*, and not of the Messiah Himself.

But in fact we have a distinct clue to the Baptist's meaning in the definite statement that it was "the works of the Christ" which occasioned the embassy; and what

¹ The order "fire and the Holy Ghost" was of course excluded when the judgment was conceived as subsequent to the outpouring of the Spirit.

² Cf. the healing "waters of judgment" of *En.* lxvii. 13 by bathing in which the kings and great ones are purified from their lusts and healed (hot sulphur baths), which flow from the place of purgation of the lustful angels, and which in the world to come "will change and become a fire which burns forever."

"works" were meant appears more specifically still in the answer of Jesus, which combines in one the two salient phases of His career: the miracles of healing, and the preaching of glad tidings of repentance and forgiveness to the poor." Isaiah xxxv. 5-6 and lxi. 1 are doubtless the passages in mind; but the two are strangely bound together by a reference to a (spiritual)¹ resurrection not suggested by either. It recalls the fact that in Mark vi. 14-16 it was also the working of "these miracles" in him, in particular (if we may judge from the apparent relation to Mark iv. 35-v. 43), the series of mighty works culminating in the *raising of Jairus' daughter from the dead*, which led to the rumours concerning Jesus as "Elias"; or, as another form of the same belief, John redivivus. If the convictions of the Baptist's contemporaries are any gauge for his own, the most natural inference is that he also, when he "hears the works of the Christ" (Matt. xi. 2.) thinks of "Elias that was for to come," the essence of whose mission was to restore the wandering, re-establish the scattered "tribes of Jacob," and prepare Israel for the Day of Yahweh by "the great Repentance." For, as we have already seen, it is the characteristic feature of this mission of Elias that it accomplished the Great Repentance by means of "mighty works," most of all that "through the prophet Elijah comes the resurrection of the dead."² But is this compatible with the Baptist's own use of *ὁ ἐρχόμενος ὀπίσω (μετά) μου* on previous occasions as "the Messenger of the Covenant"? We have admitted that there is a *primâ facie* probability in favour of giving the

¹ Even those who accept Luke's inserted story of the Son of the Widow of Nain, or regard the incident of Jairus' Daughter as having already occurred, will hardly take this as a reference to literal raisings from the dead.

² *Sota*, ix. 15; quoted by Schürer, *ubi supra*. Note also that in the Lukan form the Message of the Baptist (Luke vii. 18-23) is immediately preceded by a *raising of the dead* of peculiarly Elijan type (Luke vii. 11-17; cf. 1 Kings xvii. 17-24).

same sense to ὁ ἐρχόμενος in Matthew xi. 3 as to ὁ ἐρχόμενος ὀπίσω μου in Matthew iii. 11. But were this argument much more rigorously conclusive than it really is, we have abundant contemporary evidence of the very indefinite conception of "the Messenger" which will have occupied John's mind. Above all we have side by side with the report itself of his inquiry, the very proof we are in search of, since Jesus Himself is represented by the Evangelist, at this very time, as declaring the fulfilment in the person of the Baptist himself of *both* the great personages of the prophecy of Malachi: "This is he of whom it is written, 'Behold, I send *My Messenger* before thy face,'" and in almost the same breath, "If ye are willing to receive it, this is *Elijah* which was to come." An incongruity which was not felt by Jesus, or at least not by the Evangelists, is not likely to have hindered the Baptist. With the Baptist, as with Malachi himself, we must be content with uncertainty whether he thought of two agents of the purification of Israel or of one. But neither the occasion of the inquiry, nor the form of Jesus' answer, nor the popular rumours then or later current, suggest that the personality in question is the Messiah, but only one or other of the forerunners. In reality the Church, by its primitive doctrine of the double advent, ultimately solved the problem by making Christ His own forerunner for the work of "restoration" (Acts iii. 26, cf. verse 20), Elias becoming a mere "witness."

But what finally of Jesus' interpretation of the prophecy? Does not his answer compel us to think that in this case at least the Baptist was looking beyond the judgment of fire to the peaceful reign of the Son of David? We need not appeal to the example of John i. 21, where the Baptist's conception of his own personality and relation to Elias is certainly not brought any nearer into harmony with that of Jesus. We need only perceive the beautiful appropriateness of the answer by which Jesus

takes to Himself indeed the *work* of Elijah, the “restorer,” the preacher of repentance, the raiser from the dead, the gatherer of the outcasts of Israel; but as to His own *personality* says only, “Blessed is he that findeth none occasion of stumbling in me.” Then, if we will, we may take the utterance to the multitudes, after the disciples of John had gone their way, in its most exact and literal sense: *αὐτός ἐστιν Ἡλείας ὁ μέλλον ἔρχεσθαι*, “he (John) is *himself* Elias that was to come”; or, as we may venture to paraphrase, Not I, but John himself is the great Restorer, of whose coming he asks. As for *my* personality, blessed is he that will not let it be an impediment to his approbation (cf. verses 16–19) of the work he sees me engaged in.

B. W. BACON.

THE LIFE OF CHRIST ACCORDING TO ST.
MARK.¹

XXVII. WANDERINGS IN GENTILE LANDS, VII. 24–37,
VIII. 22–26.²

AFTER the bold step described in the last section, Jesus felt it desirable to withdraw from Jewish territory for a time, and betook Himself to the Gentile districts of Tyre and Sidon. He sought not only security, but also rest and seclusion. As St. Mark tells the story, Jesus’ recent repudiation of Mosaic Law does not seem to have been premeditated, but rather a spark struck from the mind of Jesus

¹ These studies do not profess to be an adequate historical and doctrinal account of Christ, but are an attempt to set forth the impression which St. Mark’s narrative would make on a reader who had no other source of information, and was not acquainted with Christian dogmatics.

² The section VIII. 1–21 is omitted here. It contains the Feeding of the Four Thousand, the Saying as to the Sign from Heaven, and the Discourse on the *two* Feedings. It seems to be out of place in this context; the story of the Four Thousand is apparently another version of that of the Five Thousand; and the section may be a later addition.

in the clash of controversy. When He came to reflect upon His words in cold blood, and realized all that they meant, He would be somewhat startled. At the outset Jesus had sought to remain loyal to Judaism, its worship, organization, and officials; but now He could not be blind to the fact that rejection of the observances as to clean and unclean foods involved a breach with Judaism. As at other crises, Jesus would wish for leisure and quiet to meditate on the path which lay before Him. Possibly He might find in a Gentile district a welcome obscurity which would be impossible amongst Jews; and the abominations of the heathen might stimulate His zeal for the Law of Israel. Accordingly He went northwards into the districts of Tyre and Sidon. With Divine simplicity Jesus supposed that He would not be recognized, that men would pass without notice the face from whose eyes the love of God looked out upon the world. He came to some Phoenician town, found a lodging there, and hoped to be left to Himself; but He was disappointed, "He could not be hid." If He had hoped to renew His zeal for Judaism, He was disappointed in that also, for His first experience in Gentile territory tended to draw Him farther away from the Law. He was found out by a woman who was "a Greek, a Syrophenician"—St. Mark is careful to make it quite clear that she was a Gentile. She had a daughter who was possessed by an unclean spirit, and she came to Jesus for deliverance and cleansing. His answer suggests that His recent utterance as to foods had led to a reaction of feeling which made Him hesitate to do anything which might seem to imply lack of loyalty to the Chosen People and their religion.

"Let the children first be filled," He said, "for it is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs."

"Yea, Lord," she answered, "even the dogs under the table eat of the children's crumbs."

Her humility might have soothed the sectarian jealousy

of the most bigoted Pharisee, and before such an appeal the kindly nature of Jesus was helpless ; He surrendered unconditionally.

“For this saying,” said He, “go thy way ; the devil is gone out of thy daughter.”

And she went home and found it so.

Natural and inevitable as the conduct of Jesus was, it involved another important development away from strict Judaism. He had hardly ventured beyond the borders of Jewry when He found that He must extend His mission of healing to the Gentiles. Clearly, therefore, unless barriers were built round Palestine, and all Gentiles kept outside, and all disciples of Jesus inside, the message of the Kingdom would reach the Gentiles and they would demand admission. Moreover, the phrase “let the children *first* be fed” shows that Jesus had been meditating on this problem. Israel had a prior claim, but the turn of the Gentiles would come ; by-and-by, when He had more light and wider experience, He would fix the time. At the first shock the woman’s appeal seemed premature, an unwarrantable attempt to force His hand ; a moment later He realized that new light and wider experience had come, and He discerned and followed the Divine leading.

After this incident Jesus left the neighbourhood of Tyre and went northwards along the coast to Sidon ; passed through that city, and then turned inland to the south-west, and made His way to Decapolis, the half-Gentile district east of the Sea of Galilee. We are told nothing more of His journey ; there was no proclaiming of the message in these Gentile lands ; and, no doubt, as He got further from home, He found leisure to think out anew His relation to Judaism and also to the world.

When He reached Decapolis, and only the lake separated Him from the scene of His active ministry, we find Him once more surrounded by a multitude. There was brought

to Him a deaf man with an impediment in his speech. The case presented special difficulties. Faith was usually a condition of healing; how could a deaf man's faith be quickened? Jesus took him aside privately; put His fingers in his ears; spat, and touched his tongue. By such gestures, by looks, and by general manner, Jesus suggested to the sufferer that he was about to be healed, and made a successful appeal to his faith. Then He looked up to heaven and sighed, and said to him, "Be opened"; and the man's ears were opened and his tongue was loosed, and he spoke plainly. Once again Jesus made a futile attempt to keep His gifts of healing a secret but "the more He charged them, the more they published it."

One or two features of the incident just dealt with are best considered in connexion with the next¹ incident, the healing of the blind man at Bethsaida. Probably this is the Bethsaida to the north-east of the Sea of Galilee, and both these cures were wrought in half-Gentile districts and perhaps upon Gentiles. The two incidents are also similar in other respects. In both (i.) the patient was brought to Jesus; (ii.) He took him apart to some retired spot; He took the blind man outside the village. As we have seen before, Jesus seeks strength for His mighty works in retirement, and does not rely upon the stimulus of an excited and expectant crowd. (iii.) Blindness, like deafness, hindered the appeal to the man's faith; he could not *see* Jesus, or feel the influence of His expression, and especially of His eyes. Hence in this case, also, Jesus seeks to stimulate faith by His acts and gestures; He spit on his eyes and laid His hands on them.

(iv.) The use of spittle in these two cases seems to be a use of means, like the anointing with oil by the disciples on their mission. Saliva was regarded in the east as having healing power. Here, therefore, is another illustration of

¹ See the note at the beginning of this section.

the fact that neither Jesus, nor the disciples, nor the Evangelist drew any sharp line between the natural and the supernatural. The essence of the "mighty work" was not exactly that which we call miraculous. It was a "mighty work," a "sign," a "wonder," something that no ordinary man could do; but no one thought of the "laws of nature" and their relation to such deeds, nor did the use of means affect the impression made.

(v.) In the previous case the sigh of Jesus is a sign of effort on His part, and here the effort is still more marked. At first the cure was only partial. "Dost thou see aught?" said Jesus; and the man looked up and said, "I see men, for I behold them as trees walking." A second exertion of healing energy was necessary; again He laid His hands upon his eyes, this time with complete success; the man exerted himself to look, and was restored, and saw everything clearly. The record of effort and of temporary partial failure is another illustration of the frankness of the Evangelist.

(vi.) Finally, there was yet another effort to keep an act of healing secret. Jesus sent the man away to his home, saying, "Do not even enter into the village."

XXVIII. PETER'S CONFESSION, VIII. 27-IX. 1.

From the time when Jesus repudiated the Levitical doctrine of clean and unclean meats, He had avoided the scenes of His earlier ministry and the centres of Jewish population; He had been wandering in Phoenician territory as far north as Sidon, and He had appeared in the Gentile district of Decapolis; He now turned north again to the village of Caesarea Philippi, which was practically a Greek city.

On the way thither He held a conversation with His disciples, which was the supreme crisis of the religious history of the race. A time was chosen when perfect privacy could

be secured. The hospitality of an Eastern village was public. When it was known that the sheikh was entertaining strangers, his guest-chamber was thronged with neighbours. Hence it was on the journey itself, at some solitary part of the road, probably when they were resting in some secluded spot, that Jesus put a crucial question to the disciples. Gradually He had been compelled to abandon all expectation of winning the nation at large or its religious leaders, and His hopes had become more and more centred in His immediate followers. Now the time had come for Him to test this last hope. He began with a preliminary question: "Who do men say that I am?" St. Mark has already¹ given the answer in words almost identical with those which we find here. All were agreed that He was no mere man, but that in Him the spirit of some ancient worthy lived again; He might be Elijah, or some other of the prophets, or possibly John the Baptist. Even now it seemed as if no one—except the demoniacs—thought of Him as the Messiah. But the Jews were very ready to welcome pretenders to Messiahship, so that their failure to ascribe this title to Jesus is remarkable. It measures alike the success and the failure of His popular ministry; He had succeeded in teaching the people that He was not the mere conqueror and king of the vulgar imagination; but He had failed to convince them that they ought to change their ideas of the Messiah, and that the true Messiah would be a spiritual hero and redeemer.

One hope was left. How far had the Apostles understood Him? "Whom say ye that I am?" Peter, spokesman as usual, answered, "Thou art the Messiah."

The Evangelist implies that Jesus accepted the title, that He Himself therefore had become conscious that He was the Messiah, and that He desired that His disciples should believe in His Messiahship. It is easy to understand that

¹ Mark vi. 15 f.

the disciples would be ready to acknowledge Jesus as Messiah if He gave them the least encouragement. His repudiation of popular ideas could not neutralize the effect of His personality on those who knew Him best. They might not know how to reconcile His teaching or His policy with what they had learnt as to the expected Saviour and King ; but they felt no lower, no less unique rank, could properly belong to Him.

But the reader whose impressions we are trying to reconstruct would also ask how Jesus came to believe Himself the Messiah, and what He understood by the term. St. Mark has given no explanations, neither does he quote any saying of Jesus on either topic. Probably he would not feel that the data enabled him to answer these questions satisfactorily ; but the kind of answers suggested might be somewhat as follows. The social position and education of Jesus imply that His ideas would start from the popular views of the Messiah as the social and religious reformer and the restorer of the independence and empire of Israel. Some such words would serve as a common formula for the ideas of the Jews in general as to the Messiah ; but the ideas would be variously shaped and coloured in the minds of different individuals. For Jesus of Nazareth, the Reformer and Saviour, would become an ideal figure corresponding to the nobility of His nature. How then did Jesus come to identify Himself with this ideal ? We can hardly think that Messiahship was looked upon as a destination to which a youth of exceptional endowments might naturally aspire ; and no careful reader of St. Mark's Gospel could credit Jesus with such reasoning as "Because I am specially gifted I must be the Messiah." Nevertheless there had been much in His experience to make Him feel that He was marked out from other men ; He found that He possessed unique powers over the bodies, minds, and souls of men ; He had a sense of close fellowship with God as His Father ;

and in the experiences of the Baptism and the Temptation He had realized that He was the beloved Son entrusted with a supreme Divine mission. Doubtless, too, the idea that He was the Messiah was often suggested to Him from without, as when John the Baptist spoke of Him as "He that is mightier than I, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose." But, according to St. Mark, such suggestions were made most frequently and explicitly by demoniacs, whose utterances would hardly be recognized by Jesus as a Divine intimation; though it might well be supposed that demons possessed supernatural knowledge. Perhaps some clue may be found in the position of this incident in St. Mark; it comes when the complete failure of the public ministry was patent, when Jesus had been compelled to withdraw for a time into Gentile territory, and when His most recent acts of healing had only been accomplished after special effort. Then, and not till then, did He seek and obtain from His disciples a recognition of His Messiahship. May we not believe that His experience of failure led Him to ponder afresh the story of those whom Israel had rejected before Him—Jeremiah, the Servant of Jehovah, Job—such reflections would suggest that the triumphant inauguration of a new era might not be part of the work of an ideal teacher, reformer, and redeemer—at any rate till his earthly career had ended in apparent failure; such examples would rather suggest that death, even a disgraceful death, might be the means by which the Messiah would accomplish His mission. The conviction of His Divine commission and the assurance of final achievement remained unshaken. Three courses were open to Him: either to seek safety by abandoning His mission and withdrawing into obscurity; or to bate somewhat of His ideals and compromise with popular expectations by trying to play the part of a more spiritually-minded Judas Maccabaeus; or to declare publicly that He, rejected

as He had been by the people, by the religious leaders, by His fellow-townfolk and His own family, that He was the Messiah, and to accept the fate which would be the prompt answer to such a claim. To follow this last course was the only way to perpetuate the influence of His personality and to secure the fruits of His ministry for Israel and for the world. Thus the call to the Messiahship came in the form of an appeal to Him to sacrifice His life for God and man. The most modest soldier may offer to lead a forlorn hope when no one else is able or willing. Emerson wrote once: "I am only a sort of lieutenant in the deplorable absence of captains." There may have been a time when some such words might have expressed the feelings of Jesus, but there are crises when it is criminal for a born leader of men to profess to be a mere lieutenant, and to refuse the responsibility of captaincy. Jesus, therefore, avowed Himself the Messiah, the Captain of the world's salvation.

This conversation was the crucial moment of a supreme crisis, and Peter recognized its importance. Surely now the Master would assert Himself and would use His miraculous powers to drive out the Romans, to restore the independence of Israel, and establish the Kingdom of God. But Peter was once more disappointed in Jesus; once more He failed, in the Apostle's judgment, to rise to the occasion. He bade the disciples tell no one of His Messiahship; He would choose His own time for the avowal which would be the signal of His doom; and He must first prepare them for the tragic ending of their hopes. He began to teach them that He must endure much suffering, and be rejected by the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be put to death. The "elders and chief priests and scribes" represented the ruling classes at Jerusalem, the Jewish government as far as the Jews had a government—chiefly in matters ecclesiastical—the official priesthood of the Temple, and the other classes which made up the Sanhedrim. At one time Jesus

had hoped to win over the official heads of the people ; but He soon found that such hopes were futile. The Sanhedrim consisted of Pharisees and Sadducees ; the Pharisees had rejected Him at the outset ; and the Sadducees were the party of the Jerusalem priesthood. Jesus must have discovered early in His career that ecclesiastical dignitaries do not sympathize with the reformer who disturbs a comfortable *status quo*. The Pharisees, being in a sense the opposition, would have welcomed a Messiah after their own heart who would have placed them in power ; but the Sadducaic priestly government had no use for a Messiah. His appearance would have been as obnoxious to them as the return of an absent sovereign to a council of regency. If Jesus presented Himself in Jerusalem as the Messiah, He thrust upon the priesthood the alternative of acknowledging or suppressing Him ; and virtually compelled them to put Him to death. All this Jesus understood ; yet as He explained to His disciples His purpose of crowning His ministry by the sacrifice of His life, there arose before Him perhaps for the first time a vision of the glorious future which lay beyond. When He had told them that the Son of Man must die, He added, “ And after three days He shall rise again.”

St. Mark notes that Jesus spake “ openly ” ; He did not veil His meaning in parables. Hence the prompt protest of Peter, who took His Master aside and began to rebuke Him. The Apostle’s conduct suggests that he was an older man than Jesus. It is easy to imagine the nature of the Apostle’s rebukes :—if Jesus were the Messiah, it was absurd to suppose that He was to die as a criminal ; such an idea could only be due to the morbid depression of a moment of reaction from the exaltation and exultation due possibly to Peter’s recognition of Him as the Messiah ; Peter, the decided practical Peter, had noticed such tendencies before ; he would feel called upon to rebuke His

Master's weakness, and to brace His spirit at the turning-point of his career. Peter's vigorous common sense would grope helplessly for the possible motives behind the extraordinary utterance of Jesus; but his rebuke frankly suggested that if the Master came to an untimely end, it would be due to some fault of temper or judgment on His own part.

Thus for the moment Peter's zeal and affection ranged him with the worst enemies of His Master. After an inner struggle Jesus had accepted death and apparent failure, and had committed Himself to this sacrifice by His words to His disciples. He would be worn by the effort of decision and threatened with reaction; the insinuating voices of invisible tempters told Him that His sacrifice was futile and foolish. Now His faithful friend and devoted follower unconsciously made himself the spokesman of these powers of darkness. Jesus broke from him, and turned and looked back to the other disciples; doubtless they thought what only Peter had ventured to say, and His reply was for them also. In His turn he rebuked Peter, "Get thee behind me, Satan, for thou judgest as men judge, and not as God judges."

The next paragraph describes an address to the multitude with the disciples which can hardly have been delivered immediately after the rebuke to Peter, but is nevertheless the sequel to the conversation which has just been considered. Jesus was preoccupied with His coming death; for the first time He refers to the Cross; He seems to be preaching to Himself as much as to the people. He had been tempted to save His life for noble ends, but "whosoever would save his life should lose it"—to have drawn back now would have destroyed the whole value of His ministry. "Whosoever shall lose his life for the sake of the Gospel¹ shall save it."

¹ The words "for my sake" are not certainly part of the original text.

Naturally, however, the words of Jesus are equally adapted to the audience He addressed : the disposition which led Peter to rebuke Jesus for His intended sacrifice might lead him to shrink from sacrifice himself; and Peter was a type. Hence Jesus insisted that His own conduct was to be an example to the disciples. They too were to deny themselves, and take up their cross and follow Him. If they were tempted to deny the condemned criminal as their Master, they were to be encouraged by the assurance that the Son of Man would be manifested in glory.

Another saying is given here to the effect that this assurance did not refer to some indefinitely remote future: " There were some amongst the bystanders who would live to see the Kingdom of God come with power."

W. H. BENNETT.

STUDIES IN THE FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN.

III.

THE OLD AND NEW COMMANDMENT—(continued).

THE antiquity of the law of love St. John left to speak for itself; its novelty he explains in the second clause of verse 8: ὁ ἐστὶν ἀληθὲς ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν, where the neuter relative refers not to the ἐντολή (which would have required a feminine pronoun, as in *v.* 7), but to the principal sentence as a whole,—"which thing is true," viz. the fact that the old commandment is, notwithstanding, new. And its newness is twofold; in the Head and in the members of the Body of Christ, in the Vine-stock and in the branches—ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν.

"New in Him": for the coming of Jesus, God's Son, in our flesh gave to love a meaning and a compelling force inconceivable before. His personality, character, doctrine, works, culminating in His sacrificial death, revealed the love of God to man, and revealed at the same time a capacity of love and an obligation to love in man, of which the world had no previous conception and that were astounding beyond measure in the given moral conditions and under the circumstances of Christ's advent. "Herein is love," writes St. John, pointing to the Incarnation and the Cross, "herein have we known love, in that He for us laid down His life" (iii. 16, iv. 10)—as though one had never known or heard of love before! so entirely did this demonstration surpass all antecedent notions on the subject and antiquate all earlier examples. In this sacrifice of Jesus Christ the Apostle finds the motive for unbounded devotion to our fellows: "and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren." The commandment was put upon another footing, and clothed with a fresh and irresistible power.

In His teaching Jesus recast the ancient law of Israel ; He drew out of the mass of inferior and external commands the golden rule, the two-fold duty of love to God and man ; while He appealed by all He said upon men's duty to each other to that wider and primeval law of humanity " written in the heart," retracing its effaced characters and re-awakening the affections native to man as the offspring of the Father in heaven. His human life restored to the race its lost ideal, and presented to all eyes " the new man " recreated after the image of God. His death crowned His life's work, and perfected His own filial character. But the death of the cross accomplished something more and other than this ; it gave to the law of love an authority new in its kind, a vicarious and redeeming efficacy. " Born under " this " law," Jesus Christ reconciled the world to God, and in so doing generated a force by which sinful men, now released from condemnation, are constrained and empowered to " keep the commandments " of God. Christ's disciples follow their Lord's example by the virtue of His atonement ; they " walk in love as Christ also loved them, and gave Himself up for them, an offering and sacrifice to God for an odour of fragrance." It was the cross that sent them forth to breathe Christ's love into the world, and " to lay down their lives for the brethren." " He died for all," writes the other theological Apostle (2 Cor. v. 15), " in order that the living no longer to themselves should live, but to Him who for them died and was raised," and that, as St. Paul abundantly showed by word and life, in living to Christ they should live to and for the brethren on whose behalf He died, even as each member of the body feels and works for every other (see e.g. 1 Cor. viii. 9-13, xii. 12 ff., and xiii.) The cross of Christ reconciles us " in one body " to God (Eph. ii. 16) ; the fire of Christ's love and passion fuses together natures the most hostile and remote. " The new covenant in His blood " is a covenant of amity and

alliance for all who enter its bonds and share the peace with God which it secures.

This was "true in Christ" for the writer and readers. The peace on earth which the angels' song heralded at the Nativity was an accomplished fact in the multitude of Christian societies now planted through the Roman Empire and spreading from the Mediterranean shores—each of them the centre of forces of goodwill and charity, new-leavening a world where the mass of men were "slaves to manifold lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, hating one another" (Tit. iii. 3). The *φιλαδελφία* of the followers of the Crucified, the unbounded love of Christians towards each other, was the most notable thing about the new movement; this was the outstanding characteristic dwelt upon both by its apologists and its critics in the early centuries. "See," they said, "how these Christians love one another!" So true they were in the first age to the intention of their Master, who thus fixed the peculiar mark of His society: "In this shall all men know that you are my disciples, if you have love one to another" (John xiii. 35). The oldest Christian document, the letter of Paul and his fellow-missionaries to the infant Church of Thessalonica, illustrates this feature of the original Christianity; on it the Apostle seizes, and dilates with intense satisfaction: "Concerning brotherly love you have no need that one write unto you; for you of yourselves are taught by God to love one another; for indeed you do it toward all the brethren which are in all Macedonia" (1 Thess. iv. 9 f.). In the second Epistle, following at a brief interval, he thanks God, first and foremost, "for that your faith groweth exceedingly, and the love of each one of you all toward one another aboundeth" (2 Thess. i. 3). Were it not well if all Christian teachers put this first amongst the "notes" of the Church, and saw in this sign, rather than in formularies or institutions, the token of apostolical descent?

“Which is true,” the Apostle dares to say to his disciples, “in Him *and in you*” ! The fact that God’s law of love was kept, that a new and powerful bond of affection was formed amongst men and a new gravitation was drawing the scattered elements of life together, was as evident in the case of these Christian men as it was in Christ Himself. It means much that St. John should couple “Him” and “you” in this sentence and put the two pronouns into the same construction. “Everyone when he is perfected,” said Jesus, “shall be as his Master.” How many amongst ourselves, Christ’s present servants, could bear to be put in this juxtaposition? of what Church could it be affirmed without misgiving, concerning the law of love to the brethren, “Which is true in Him and in you” ?

In this double truth there is a deep distinction—as between the root and the branches, the full fountain and the dispersed and too often checked and dwindling streams, which need constant replenishment. But in principle, and aim, and issue, the identity holds good for all who are “in Him.” The law that ruled His being rules theirs. The fires of His passion have thrown a spark into each of their souls, kindling them to something of the same heat and glow. The prayer of Jesus Christ for His discipleship, as it should endure and witness to the world’s end, is so fulfilled, “that they may all be one; even as Thou, Father, art in me and I in Thee,” and “that the love wherewith Thou lovedst me may be in them, and I in them” (John xvii. 23, 26). Just so far as this affirmation respecting St. John’s little children “is true” in us, the true Christianity still propagates itself and bears its genuine fruit amongst men.

The coming of this new love, that had given such bright evidence of its vitality and worth in the Christian society, St. John explains in verse 8*b*; he refers it to “the message” which Christ brought from God, and which His

Apostles are announcing everywhere (i. 5). The true life springs from "the true light" (τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν¹ ἥδη φαίνει). In the light of the Gospel, and through the revelation of God that it imparts, the new way of love is disclosed and the life that is alone worthy of man becomes possible to him. St. Paul gives under this figure another turn to the same thought; he affirms the social results of the Gospel to be the outgrowth of its religious conceptions, when he writes, in Eph. v. 9, "The fruit of the light is in all goodness and righteousness and truth." The ethical and theological are inseparable as life and light, as fruit and root. The morals of Paganism were the native product of its idolatry—of "the darkness" which St. John sees "passing away";² Christian morals, the purity and charity of the Apostolic Church, sprang by a like necessity from the ideas of God and of His disposition and relations to men derived from the Christian revelation.

"*Already* shineth," the rendering given by the Revisers to ἥδη φαίνει, is a questionable emendation of the older version. "Already" marks, in English usage, a present antithetical to some future—"so soon as this"; as though

¹ The double "true" of our version represents two, somewhat differing, Greek adjectives, ἀληθές and ἀληθινόν: the former signifies truth of *statement*—i.e. of the statement made by John in verse 8a, which is verified by fact; the latter signifies truth of *conception*, where the reality corresponds to the idea that is expressed. A "true light" (ἀληθινόν) is that which is light indeed and worthy of the name; cf. the use of this adjective, which is characteristic of St. John, in v. 20, John iv. 23, vi. 32, xv. 1, and in 1 Thess. iv. 9. φῶς ἀληθές would be a light that does not deceive, that gives true guidance or conveys a truthful message.

² παράγεται, again in verse 17; more literally, "passes by." Elsewhere the active voice bears this (neuter) sense; so in the Pauline parallel of 1 Cor. vii. 31, παράγει τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου; cf. Ps. cxliii. 4, αἱ ἡμέραι αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ σκιά παράγονσι; and in the literal sense, John ix. 1, Matt. ix. 9. The verb conveys the thought not of a mere vanishing or cessation, but of a visible movement from the scene, as when clouds are sailing off and the sky clears. Possibly, there is a touch of significance in the use of the passive, which does not occur in this sense outside these two verses. Not of its own motion is "the darkness" passing, but it is *borne away* by the flood of incoming light.

the Apostle meant: "The true light shines even now while the darkness still strives against it; a brighter day is coming, when its light will flood the world, when the darkness will have utterly passed away and the whole sky will be aflame with the glory of God. 'It is beginning to have its course'" (Westcott). This thought, however true, and the prophetic connotation this rendering gives to ἡδὴ (as e.g. in iv. 3, John iv. 35, 2 Thess. ii. 7, 2 Tim. ii. 18, etc.) are out of place in the given connexion. ἡδὴ looks backward as readily as forward; it denotes a present contrasted either with future or past (for the latter, cf. John vii. 14, xi. 17, xix. 28, Rom. i. 10, 2 Tim. iv. 6), and signifies *by this time, now at length*. This may be the rarer sense of the adverb, but it is a perfectly legitimate sense, and is imported here by the contrast of "old and new" dominating this paragraph. A new day is dawning for the world. At last the darkness lifts; the clouds begin to break and scatter; "the true light shines" out in the sky; and in the light its sons can walk with clear vision, to a sure and blissful goal.

Once besides the Apostle John has employed this phrase, describing the advent of the Word with the same retrospective gaze and under the same image of a light long veiled but now piercing through all obstruction, where he writes in the prologue to his Gospel, ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν . . . ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον, "There was the true light [of which the Baptist had borne witness as existing, though unknown, long before his testimony to it] . . . it was coming into the world." *Now at last!* "The mystery hidden from the ages and generations,—hidden away from the ages in God who created all things" (Col. i. 26, Eph. iii. 9), comes to its birth. The hour of the new creation has struck; the word has gone forth, and the Voice has sounded which says, "Behold, I make all things new!"

What the future may disclose, and to what splendour the great day may grow, St. John does not here suggest or

speculate. "The Son of God is come; we have eternal life in Him" (v. 11-13, 20): this conviction fills his mind and brings a perfect satisfaction. He has lived through a day of new creation; he has "seen the kingdom of God come in power." The religious world of his childhood and that of his age—what a gulf lies between them, a contrast between the old and the new within a single lifetime the more astonishing the more he reflects upon it. Enough for him that the darkness is now passing—"the world is passing away, and its lust" (verse 17)—and the true light mounts the sky. He is as one who descries the morn in the east, after a long tempestuous night he has seen the sun climb the horizon, and is sure of day. The old Apostle is well content, and ready to say with Simeon, "Lord, now lettest Thou thy servant depart in peace according to thy word; for mine eyes have seen thy salvation."

GEORGE G. FINDLAY.

THE LETTER TO THE CHURCH IN THYATIRA.

THIS is in many respects the most obscure, as it is certainly the longest, and probably in a historical view the most instructive of all the Seven Letters. Its obscurity is doubtless caused in a considerable degree by the fact that the history of Thyatira, and the character and circumstances of the city in the first century after Christ, are almost entirely unknown to us. Hence those allusions to the past history and the present situation of affairs in the city, which in the case of the first three cities we have found the most instructive and illuminative parts of each letter, are in the case of Thyatira the most obscure. We have some idea of what were the proper topics for an orator to enlarge on when he wished to please the people of Ephesus or Pergamum. We know how a rhetorician like Aelius Aristides tickled the ears of the Smyrnaeans. We know what events in the past history of those cities, as well as of Sardis, had sunk into the heart of the inhabitants, and were remembered by all with ever fresh joy or sorrow. Even in the case of the secondary cities, Laodiceia and Philadelpheia, we learn something from various ancient authorities about the leading facts of their history and present circumstances, the sources of their wealth, the staple of their trade, the disasters that had befallen them. But about Thyatira we know extremely little. Historians and ancient writers generally rarely allude to it, and the numerous inscriptions which have been discovered and published throw little or no light (so far as yet known) upon the letter which we are now studying.

There is a considerable resemblance between the Thyatiran and Pergamenian letters. Those were the only two of the Seven Cities which had been strongly affected by the

Nicolaitan teaching, and both letters are dominated by the strenuous hatred of the writer for that heresy. Moreover, those two cities lay a little apart from the rest, away in the north of Lydia, or even across the frontier in the land of Mysia,¹ and it may therefore be presumed that they had a certain local character in common. Accordingly, there is a distinct type common to the preliminary address and the promise at the end of those two letters. The strength of authority, the sword as the symbol of the power of life and death,² the tessera inscribed with the secret name of might—such are the topics that give character to the Pergamenian exordium and conclusion. The Thyatiran letter proceeds from “the Son of God, who hath His eyes like a flame of fire and His feet like unto bright bronze”³ (the very hard alloyed metal, used for weapons, and under proper treatment assuming a brilliant polished gleam approximating to gold); to the victorious Christian of Thyatira is promised “authority over the nations, and he shall rule them with a rod of iron as the vessels of the potter are broken to shivers”; the terror and, as one might almost say, the cruelty of this promise is mitigated by the conclusion, “and I will give him the morning star.” The spirit of the address and the promise is throughout of dazzlingly impressive might, authority, the irresistible strength of a great monarch, and a vast, well-ordered army.

¹ Pergamum was regularly reckoned a Mysian city, but the frontier of Mysia was so uncertain as to be proverbial, and Thyatira, while close to the frontier, and called by some “the last city of Mysia,” was more usually counted Lydian, but was in the closest relations with Pergamum, and under the immediate power of the Pergamenian kings.

² The right of the sword, *jus gladii*, was the customary and technical term among the Romans to designate that power. Officials were divided into two classes, higher and lower, according as they had the *jus gladii* or not.

³ The term *chalkolibanos*, which is used in the Apocalypse, does not occur elsewhere; but the context and the general sense of the passage show that it is likely to be some kind of bronze, an alloy much used by the ancients, and made very skilfully so as to be capable of taking a keen edge as well as a brilliant hue.

In short, just as in the case of Pergamum, so here again, the promise sets the true and victorious Christian in the place and dignity of the Roman Emperor. Rome was the only power on earth that exercised authority over the nations, and ruled them with a rod of iron, and smashed them like potsherds; and the description is startlingly applicable to the Roman State. Accordingly the promise here designates the victor as heir to a greater, more terrible, more irresistible strength than even the power of the mighty Empire with all its legions. The opposition was more precisely and antithetically expressed in the case of Pergamum, at least to the readers who were within the circle of ancient ideas and education; though probably the modern mind is likely to recognize the antithesis between the Church and the Empire more readily and clearly in the Thyatiran letter. We at the distance of nearly 2,000 years can more readily call up in imagination the military strength of the Empire and its armies; but in the first century the minds of men were filled and awed by the thought of the Emperor as the central figure of the whole earth, concentrating on himself the loyal religious feelings of all nations, and holding in his hands that complete authority, indefinable because too wide for definition, which the autocrat of the civilized world exercised by the simple expression of his will; and that is the idea to which the Pergamenian letter appealed.

It could not escape the attention of an Asian reader at that time that this irresistible power and strength were promised to the city which was probably the smallest¹ and feeblest, certainly in general estimation the least distinguished and famous, of all the Seven Cities. The local surroundings of Thyatira accentuate this comparatively humble character of its fortunes. It lies in the middle of

¹ Philadelpheia was perhaps smaller than Thyatira; but it certainly enjoyed a history characterized by greater distinction and reputation.

a long valley running north and south between parallel ridges of hills of no great elevation, which rise with gentle slope from the valley. In the midst of the modern city there is a low tumulus, which probably served for an acropolis. Thus there is the most marked contrast between the situation of Thyatira—now “sleeping safe in the bosom of the plain” under the peace of the Roman rule, though (if any enemies had existed) easily open to attack from every side, dominated by even those low and gentle ranges of hills on east and west, beautiful with a gentle, smiling, luxuriant softness and grace—and the proud and lofty acropolis of Sardis, or the huge hill of Pergamum, or the mountain-walls of Ephesus and the castled hill of Smyrna, each with its harbour, or the long sloping hillside on which Philadelpheia rises high above its plain, or the plateau of Laodiceia, not lofty, yet springing sharp and bold from the plain of the Lycus, crowned with a long line of strong walls and so situated on the protruding apex of a triangular extent of hilly ground that it seems to stand up in the middle of the plain.

Military skill, such as the Pergamenian kings had at their command, could of course so fortify Thyatira as to make it strong enough to hold the passage up the long valley. The importance of the city to the kings lay in the fact that it guarded the main road from the Hermus valley and Lydia generally to Pergamum. Its function in the world at first had been to serve as attendant and guard to the governing royal city. Now, under the long peace of the imperial rule, it had become a town of trade and peaceful industry, profiting by its command of a fertile plain and still more by its situation on a great road; and beyond all doubt the military character of its foundation by the kings, as a garrison of Macedonian soldiers to block the road to their capital from the south, had long disappeared.

Thus Thyatira of all the Seven Cities seemed in every

way the least fitted by nature and by history to rule over the nations ; and it could not fail to be observed by the Asian readers as a notable thing, that the Church of this least famous and weakest of the cities should be promised such a future of strength and universal authority. Beyond all doubt the writer of the Seven Letters, who knew the cities so well, must have been conscious of this, and must have relied on it for the effect which he aimed at.

As we go through the Seven Letters point by point, each detail confirms our impression of the unhesitating and sublime confidence in the victory of the Church which prompts and enlivens them. The Emperor, the Roman State, with its patriotism, its religion, and its armies, the brutal populace of the cities, the Jews, and every other enemy of the Church, all are raging and persecuting and slaying to the utmost of their power. But their power is naught. The real Church stands outside of their reach, immeasurably above them, secure and triumphant, "eternal in the heavens," while the individual Christians work out their victory in their own life and above all by their death ; so that the more successfully the enemy kills them off, the more absolute is his defeat, and the more complete and immediate is their victory. The weakest and least honoured among those Christian martyrs, as he gains his victory by death, is invested with that authority over the nations, which the proud Empire believed that its officials and governors wielded, and rules with a power more supreme than that of Rome herself.

The conclusion of the promise, "I will give him the morning star," seems to have been added with the calculated intention of expressing the other side of the Christian character. The honour promised was evidently too exclusively terrible. But the addition must be in keeping with the rest of the promise. The brightness, gleam, and glitter, as if of "an army with banners," which rules through the

opening address and the concluding promise, is expressed in a milder spirit, without the terrible character, though the brilliance remains or is even increased, in the image of "the morning star."

So little is known about the tutelary deity of Thyatira, Apollo Tyrimnaios, that it is impossible to say whether any contrast is intended between the description of the sender of the message and that native deity. He was a sun-god, represented often with radiated head, like a star or the sun; and often he bears on his shoulder a double-edged battle-axe. Thus brilliant glitter and the smashing power of a war-god or a great army are suitable to him.

Having observed the close relation between the Pergamene and the Thyatiran letter, we shall recognize a similar analogy between the Ephesian and the Sardian, and again between the Smyrnaean and the Philadelphian letters. Those six letters constitute three pairs, and each pair must be studied not only separately but also in the mutual relation of its two parts. Only the Laodicean letter stands alone, just as Laodiceia stood apart from the other six, the representative of the distant and very different Phrygian land.

So far, it is easy to recognize the appropriateness of the address and the concluding promise in this letter. But, beyond this, there is undoubtedly much that is hidden from us. Whether the *chalkolibanos*, which is peculiar to this part of the Apocalypse, had any special connexion with Thyatira must remain doubtful. It is certain that the city was a trading and manufacturing centre. The workers in bronze were one of its numerous trade-guilds;¹ and the question may be thrown out, but cannot be at present answered, whether *chalkolibanos* was a Thyatiran manu-

¹ The guild (or is it a pair of guilds?) *χαλκεῖς χαλκοῦποι* is mentioned in an inscription.

facture. The word occurs also in i. 15 (and nowhere else in ancient literature); but the opening description of "one like unto a son of man," i. 12 ff., was obviously composed with a view to the Seven Letters, so as to exhibit there, united in one personality, the various characteristics which were to be thereafter mentioned separately in the letters. Accordingly the chalkolibanos may probably have suggested itself in the first place for the purposes of the Thyatiran letter; so that its use in i. 15 may be secondary, merely to prepare for the letter.

As usual, the letter proper begins with the statement that the writer is well acquainted with the history and fortunes of the Thyatiran Church. The brief first statement is entirely laudatory. "I know thy works, and thy love and faith and ministry and patience, and that thy last works are more than the first." Whereas Ephesus had fallen away from its original spirit and enthusiasm, Thyatira had grown more energetic as time elapsed.

But after this complimentary opening, the letter denounces the state of the Thyatiran Church in the most outspoken and unreserved way. It had permitted and encouraged the Nicolaitan doctrine and harboured the principal exponent of that doctrine in the Province.

We observe here, first of all, that the Nicolaitan doctrine had not caused any falling off in the good deeds of the Church. On the contrary, it was probably the emulation between the two parties or sections of the Church, and the desire of the Nicolaitans to show that they were quite as fervent in the faith as the simpler Christians whose opinions they desired to correct, that caused the improvement in the "works" of the Thyatiran Church. We recognize that it was quite possible for Nicolaitans to continue to cherish "love and faith and ministry and patience," and to improve in the active performance of the practical work of a congregation (among which public charities and

subscriptions were doubtless an important part). Public subscriptions for patriotic and religious purposes were common in the Graeco-Roman world; the two classes were almost equivalent in ancient feeling; all patriotic purposes took a religious form, and though only the religious purpose is as a rule mentioned in the inscriptions in which such contributions are recorded, the real motive in most cases was patriotic, and the custom of making such subscriptions was undoubtedly kept up by the Christian Church generally (see Acts xi. 29, xxiv. 17, 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2, 2 Cor. ix. 1-5). The Thyatiran Nicolaitans, true to their cherished principle of assimilating the Church usage as far as possible to the character of existing society, would naturally encourage and maintain the custom. It makes this letter more credible in other points, that in this one it cordially admits and praises the generosity of the whole Thyatiran Church, including the Nicolaitans.

It seems therefore to be beyond all doubt that, as a rule, the Nicolaitans of Thyatira, with the prophetess as their leader, were still active and unwearied members of the Church, "full of good works," and respected by the whole congregation for their general character and way of life. The sentiment entertained with regard to them by the congregation is attested by the letter: "Thou sufferest the woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, and she teacheth." It is evident that the lady who is here so rudely referred to was generally accepted in Thyatira as a regular teacher, and as a prophetess and leader in the Church. There was no serious, general, active opposition to her; and therein lay the fault of the whole congregation; she had firmly established herself in the approval of the congregation; and, as we have seen, she was so respected because by her liberal and zealous and energetic life she had deserved the public esteem. She was evidently an active and managing lady after the style of Lydia, the

Thyatiran merchant and head of a household at Philippi ; and it is an interesting coincidence that the only two women of Thyatira mentioned in the New Testament are so like one another in character. The question might even suggest itself whether they may not be the same person, since Lydia seems to disappear from Philippian history (so far as we are informed of it) soon after St. Paul's visit to the city. But this question must undoubtedly be answered in the negative, for it is utterly improbable that the hostess of St. Paul would ever be spoken about so mercilessly and savagely as this poor prophetess is here.

I believe, as stated in the article on the country Lydia in Dr. Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, that Lydia was only a secondary name, "the Lydian," and that either Syntyche or Euodia, Phil. iv. 2, was her primary name, the secondary name being (as often) the commonly used and familiar name, like Priscilla for Prisca, Silas for Silvanus, Apollos for Apollonius. The prophetess furnishes just one more example of the great influence exerted by women in the primitive Church.

The extremely bitter and almost virulent tone in which the prophetess is spoken of seems, therefore, not to be due to her personal character, but to be caused entirely by the principles which she set forth in a too persuasive and successful way : she was exercising an unhealthy influence, and her many excellent qualities made her the more dangerous, because they increased the authority of her words. At the present day, when we love milder manners and are full of allowance for difference of opinion and conduct in others, the harshness with which disapproval is here expressed must seem inharmonious and repellent. But the writer was influenced by other ways of thinking and different principles of action ; and we should not estimate either him or the prophetess by twentieth century standards.

It may be added that I have read more than once Prof. E. Schü er's paper on the Thyatiran Jezebel (published, if my memory does not deceive me, in a volume of papers presented to Prof. Weizsäcker, or some other distinguished Biblical scholar)¹—at first with admiration and interest, but with growing dissatisfaction during subsequent thought, until in a final closer study of the whole Seven Letters, it seems to me to be entirely mistaken in its whole line of interpretation. He finds in "Jezebel" a prophetess and priestess of the temple of a Chaldaean Sibyl in Thyatira, where a mixture of pagan rites with Jewish ideas was practised.

It is unnecessary here to dilate on the importance of the order of prophets in the primitive Church; but we should be glad to know more about this Thyatiran prophetess, a person of broad views and reasonable mind, who played a prominent part in a great religious movement, and perished defeated and decried. She ranks with the Montanist prophetesses of the second century, or the Cappadocian prophetess about whom Firmilian wrote to Cyprian in the third century; one of those leading women who seem to have emphasized too strongly one side of a case, quite reasonable in itself, through failure to see the other side sufficiently. They all suffer the hard fate of being known only through the mouth of bitter enemies, who had no sympathy for their opinions, whose disapproval of their opinions was expressed in the harsh, contemptuous, half-figurative language of ancient moral condemnation. Thus for the most part they are stigmatized as persons of the worst character and the vilest life.

We take a much more favourable view of the character of the lady of Thyatira than the commentators usually do. Thus Mr. Anderson Scott speaks of her teaching as "encouragement to licentiousness," and of the "libertinism which was taught and practised in Thyatira"; and she is

¹ As mentioned in the previous article, this one also is more subject than usual to inaccuracy, having been written almost without books.

generally regarded as entirely false, abandoned and immoral in her life and her teaching. This usual view is founded mainly on the misinterpretation of ii. 22, which will be explained in the sequel. It seems to us to miss completely the real character and the serious nature of the question which was being agitated at the time, and which probably was finally determined and set at rest by the decision stated in the Seven Letters and in the oral teaching of the author. In this and various other so-called "heresies" the right side was not so clear and self-evident as it is commonly represented in the usual popularly accepted histories of the Church and commentaries on the ancient authorities. The prophetess was not all evil—that idea is absolutely contradictory of the already quoted words of the letter, ii. 19—and the opposite party had no monopoly of the good.

The strong language of ii. 20, 21 is due in part to the common symbolism found in the Old Testament and elsewhere, describing the lapses of Israel into idolatry as adultery and gross immorality. But in greater measure it is due to the fact that the idolatrous ritual of paganism was always in practice associated with immoral customs of various kinds; that (even although a few persons of higher mind and nobler nature might perhaps recognize that the immorality was not an essential part of the pagan ritual, but was due to degeneracy and degradation) it was impossible to dissociate the one from the other; and that the universal opinion of pagan society accepted as natural and justifiable and right—if not carried to ruinous extremes—such a way of life, with such relations between the sexes, as Christianity and Judaism have always stigmatized as vicious, degrading, and essentially wrong. The principles of the Nicolaitans seemed to St. John certain to lead to an acquiescence in this commonly accepted standard of pagan society, and he held that the Nicolaitan prophetess was

responsible for all that followed from her teaching. That he was right no one can doubt who studies the history of Greek and Roman and West Asiatic paganism as a practical force in human life. That there were lofty qualities and some high ideals in those pagan religions the present writer has always recognized and maintained in the most emphatic terms; but, in human nature, the inevitable tendency of paganism was towards a low standard of moral life, as he has tried to set forth clearly in an account of the Religion of Greece and Asia Minor in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. v.

A third reason also determined the author to employ the strong language which occurs in ii. 20. Evidently the decision of the Apostolic Council, though relating to a different question, dictated the form which the author of the letter has employed. That decision was evidently present in his memory as authoritative on an allied question; and he alludes to it in an easily understood way, which he evidently expected his readers to appreciate. He turns in v. 24 to address the section of the Thyatiran Church which had not accepted the Nicolaitan teaching, and tells them that he lays no other burden upon them. The burden which has been already imposed on all Christians by the Council is sufficient, "These necessary things, that ye abstain from things sacrificed to idols . . . and from fornication" (Acts xv. 28). The expression, "no other burden," implies that the necessary minimum burden is already before the writer's mind, and that he assumes it to be also before the reader's mind; he assumes that the readers have already caught the allusion in ii. 20, "She teacheth and seduceth my servants to commit fornication and to eat things sacrificed to idols," i.e. she teaches them to violate the fundamental rule of the Apostolic Council. But, as he implies, while this minimum burden must be borne and cannot be avoided by any sophistry and skilful religious

casuistry—what the Nicolaitans called “transcendental conception of the things of God,” but which is really “the cryptic lore and deep lies of the devil”—he imposes on them no further burden. This is sufficient, but it is inevitable; there is no more to be said. The Nicolaitans explain this away, and thereby condemn themselves.

I have assumed hitherto that the true reading is “the woman Jezebel,” as in R.V. and A.V.; but with Alford I think it probable that the proper text is *τὴν γυναῖκα σου*, where the form which commonly is equivalent to “thy wife” is used symbolically to indicate a specially prominent woman in the Thyatiran Church. There was great temptation to drop out *σου*, to avoid the apparent incongruity of calling Jezebel the wife of the Church; and there was no reason for its insertion, if it had not originally had a place in the text. As we understand the context, the addition of *σου* only expresses more emphatically a meaning which lies in the passage as a whole, even when *σου* is omitted.

The following sentences are the one main source of all the little we can gather about the Nicolaitan principles. The allusions in the Pergamenian letter, obscure in themselves, become more intelligible when read in connexion with the words here. The obscurity is due to our ignorance of what was familiar to the original Asian readers. They were living through these questions, and caught every allusion and hint that the writer of the letter makes.

The questions which are here treated belong to an early period in the history of the Church. They are connected with the general conduct of pagan converts in the Church. How much should be required of them? What burdens should be imposed on them? The principles that should regulate their conduct are here regarded, of course, from the point of view of their relation to the general society of the cities in which they lived. They had for the most part

been members, and some of them leading members, of that society before their conversion: we may here leave out of sight the Christianized Jews in the Asian congregations, who had in a way been outside of that society from the beginning, for, though they were a part, and possibly even an influential part, of the Church, yet the Seven Letters were not intended specially for them, and hardly touch the questions that most intimately concerned them. These letters are addressed to pagan converts, and set forth in a figurative way the principles that they should follow in their relations with ordinary society and the Roman State.

On the other hand, the relation of the pagan converts to Judaism is hardly alluded to in the Seven Letters. That question was now past and done with; the final answer had been given; there was no need for further instructions about it. In practice, of course, the relation between Jewish Christians and pagan converts continued to exist in the congregations; but the general principles were now admitted, and were of such a kind as to place an almost impassable barrier between the national Jews and the Church. To the writer of the Seven Letters, the Jews were the sham Jews, "the synagogue of Satan," according to a twice repeated expression: God had turned away from them, and had preferred the pagan converts, who now were the true seed of Abraham: the sham Jews would have to recognize the facts, accept the situation, and humble themselves before the Gentile Christians: "Behold, I give of the Synagogue of Satan, of them which say they are Jews and they are not, but speak falsely; behold I will make them to come and worship before thy feet, and to know that I have loved thee." Thus the situation in the Church was developed now far beyond what it had been in the time of St. Paul: and his settlement of the Jewish question had been accepted completely by the Church, and is stated as emphatically and aggressively here by this Jewish writer as by Paul himself.

It is unnecessary here to repeat the elaborate discussion of this subject already given in the EXPOSITOR, present series, vol. ii. pp. 429-444, vol. iii. 93-110. There some of the many difficulties are described which presented themselves every day to the converts from paganism. It was accepted on all hands that they were to continue to live in the world, and were not to seek to withdraw entirely out of it (1 Cor. v. 10). There were certain accepted customs, rules of politeness and courtesy, ways of living and acting, which were recommended by their graceful, refined, elegant character, and other ways which without any special grace were recommended simply because they were the ordinary methods of behaviour. If we live in a long-established and cultivated society, we must do many things, not because we specially approve of them, or derive pleasure or advantage of any kind from them, but simply from consideration for the feelings of others, who expect us to do as the rest of society does. There are even some things which we hardly quite approve; yet we do not feel that we ought to condemn them openly and withdraw in a marked way from social gatherings where they are practised. Such extremely strict carrying out of our own principles would quickly become harsh, rude, and misanthropic; and would justly expose any one who was often guilty of it to the charge of self-conceit and spiritual pride.

How much might one accept; and what must one condemn? Such questions as these were daily presenting themselves to the Christians in the Graeco-Roman cities; and they were then almost invariably complicated by the additional difficulty that all established usages, social customs, rules of polite conduct, forms of graceful courtesy, were (with rare exceptions) implicated in and coloured by idolatrous associations. Grace before meat, thanksgiving after food, were in the strictest sense slight acts of acknowledgment of the kindness and the rights of pagan divinities. Such cere-

monies had often become mere forms, and those who complied with those customs were often hardly conscious of the religious character of the action. How far was the Christian bound to take notice of their idolatrous character and to avoid acting in accordance with them, or even to express open disapproval of them? So far as we can gather, the rule laid down by St. Paul, and the practice of the Church, was that only in quite exceptional, rare cases should open disapproval of the customs of society be expressed; in many cases, where the idolatrous connexion was not obvious, but only veiled or remote, the Christian might (and perhaps even ought to) comply with the usual forms, unless his attention was expressly called by any one of the guests to the idolatrous connexion; in that case that rude remark was equivalent to a challenge either to deny or affirm his religion, and the Christian must affirm his religion, and refuse compliance. But, where the idolatrous character of the act was patent and generally recognized, the Christian must refuse compliance. There was a general tendency among the Christians to avoid situations, offices, and paths of life, in which the performance of idolatrous ceremonial was necessary; and on this account they were generally stigmatized as morose, hostile to existing society, deficient in active patriotism, if not actually disloyal.

Besides these slighter cases, there were many of a much more serious character. The Roman soldier, marching under the colours of his regiment, was marching under the standard of idolatry, for the standards (*signa*) were all divine, and worship was paid to them by the soldiers as a duty of the service, and all contained one or more idolatrous symbols or representations; moreover he was frequently required, standing in his place in the ranks, to take part in idolatrous acts of worship. The soldier could not retire and take to some other way of life, for he was bound to the service through a long term of years. Here, again, the rule

and practice of the Church seems to have been that in ordinary circumstances the converted soldier should remain passive, and as far as possible silent, during the ceremony at which he was compulsorily present, but should not actively protest. A similar practice was encouraged by the Church in other departments of life and work. But in every case, and in every profession, the Christian, who in ordinary circumstances might remain passive and unprotesting, was liable to be pointedly challenged as to whether he willingly would perform this act of worship of the deity whom he considered false. In case of such a challenge, there was only one course open. The Christian could not comply with a demand which was expressly made a test of his faith.

But apart from all these many doubtful cases where the right line of conduct was difficult to determine and might vary according to circumstances, there was a large number of cases in which the decision of the early leaders of the Church was absolute and unvarying. In whatsoever society, or company, or meeting, or ceremonial, the condition of presence and membership lay in the performance of pagan ritual as an express and declared act of religion, the Christian must have no part or lot, and could not accept membership or even be present. Here the Nicolaitans took the opposite view, and could defend their opinion by many excellent, thoroughly reasonable and highly philosophic arguments. To illustrate this class of cases, we may take an example of a meeting which was permissible, and of one which was not, according to the opinion of those early leaders of the Church. A meeting of the citizens of a city for political purposes was always inaugurated by pagan ritual, and according to the strict original theory the citizens in this political assembly were all united in the worship of the patron national deity in whose honour the opening ceremonies were performed; but the ritual had long be-

come a mere form, and nobody was in practice conscious that the condition of presence in the assembly lay in the loyal service of the national deity. The political condition was the only one that was practically remembered: every member of a city tribe had a right to be present and vote. The Christian citizen might attend and vote in such a meeting, ignoring and passing in silence the opening religious ceremony.

But, on the other hand, there were numerous societies for a vast variety of purposes, the condition of membership in which was professedly and explicitly the willingness to engage in the worship of a pagan deity, because the society met in the worship of that deity, the name of the society was often a religious name, and the place of meeting was dedicated to the deity, and thus was constituted a temple for his worship. The Epistles of Paul, Peter, Jude, and the Seven Letters, all touch on this topic, and all are agreed: the true Christian cannot be a member of such societies. The Nicolaitans taught that Christians ought to remain members; and doubtless added that they would exercise a good influence on them by continuing in them.

This very simple and practical explanation will, doubtless, seem to many scholars to be too slight for the serious treatment that the subject receives in the two letters which we are studying. Such scholars regard grave matters of dogma as being the proper subject for treatment in the early Christian documents; they will probably ridicule the suggestion that the question whether a Christian should join a club or not demanded the serious notice of an apostle, and declare that this was the sort of question on which the Church kept an open mind, and left great liberty to individuals to act as they thought right (just as they did in regard to military service, magistracies, and other important matters); and will require that Nicolaitanism should be regarded from a graver dogmatic point of view. The

present writer must confess that those graver subjects of dogma seem to him to have been much over-estimated; it was not dogma that moved the world, but life. Frequently, when rival parties and rival nations fought with one another as to which of two opposed dogmas was the truth, they had been arrayed against one another by more deep-seated and vital causes, and merely inscribed at the last the dogmas on their standards or chose them as watchwords or symbols. We are tired of those elaborate discussions of the fine, wire-drawn, subtle distinctions between sects, and of the principles of heresies, and we desire to see the real differences in life and conduct receive more attention.

It is not difficult to show how important in practical life was this question as to the right of Christians to be members of social clubs. The clubs were one of the most deep-rooted customs of Graeco-Roman society: some were social, some political, some for mutual benefit, but all took a religious form. New religions usually spread by means of such clubs. The clubs bound their members closely together in virtue of the common sacrificial meal, a scene of enjoyment following on a religious ceremony. They represented in its strongest form the pagan spirit in society; and they were strongest among the middle classes in the great cities, persons who possessed at least some fair amount of money and made some pretension to education, breeding and knowledge of the world. To hold aloof from the clubs was to set oneself down as a mean-spirited, grudging, ill-conditioned person, hostile to existing society, devoid of generous impulse and kindly neighbourly feeling, an enemy of mankind.

The very fact that this subject was treated (as we have seen) so frequently, shows that the question was not easily decided, but long occupied the attention of the Church and its leaders. It was almost purely a social and

practical question; and no subject presents such difficulties to the legislator as one which touches the fabric of society and the ordinary conduct of life. In 1 Cor. (as was pointed out in the EXPOSITOR, *loc. cit.* ii. p. 436) the subject, though not formally brought before St. Paul for decision, was practically involved in a question which was submitted to him, but he did not impose any absolute prohibition; and he tried to place the Corinthians on a higher plane of thought so that they might see clearly all that was involved and judge for themselves rightly.

After this the question must have frequently called for consideration, and a certain body of teaching had been formulated. It is clear that the Pergamenian and Thyatiran letters assume in the readers the knowledge of such teaching as familiar; and 2 Peter ii. 1 ff. refers to the same formulated teaching (EXPOSITOR, *loc. cit.* iii. p. 106 ff.). This teaching quoted examples from Old Testament history (especially Balaam or Sodom and Gomorrah) as a warning of the result that must inevitably follow from laxity in this matter; it drew scathing pictures of the revelry, licence and intoxication of spirit which characterized the feasts of these pagan religious societies, where from an early hour in the afternoon the members, lounging on the dining-couches, ate and drank and were amused by troops "of singing and of dancing slaves"; it argued that such periodically recurring scenes of excitement must be fatal to all reasonable, moderate, self-restraining spirit. This steadily growing body of formulated moral principles on the subject was set aside by the Nicolaitans, who taught, on the contrary (as is said in 2 Peter *l.c.*) that men should have confidence in their own character and judgment, and promised to set them free from a hard law, while they were in reality enticing back to lascivious enjoyment the young converts who had barely "escaped the defilements of the world."

The author of the letters now before us depends for his

effect on such striking pictures as that in 2 Peter of revels which were not merely condoned by pagan opinion, but were regarded as a duty, in which graver natures ought occasionally to relax their seriousness, and yield to the impulses of nature, in order to return again with fresh zest to the real work of life. The author had himself often already set before his readers orally the contrast between that pagan spirit of liberty and animalism, and the true Christian spirit; and had counselled the Thyatiran prophetess to wiser principles.

Thus, this controversy was of the utmost importance in the early Church. It affected and determined, more than any other, the relation of the new religion to the existing forms and character of Graeco-Roman city society. The real meaning of it was this—should the Church accept the existing forms of society and social unions, or declare war against them? And this again implied another question—should Christianity conform to the existing, accepted principles of society, or should it force society to conform to its principles? When the question is thus put in its full and true implication, we see forthwith how entirely wrong the Nicolaitans and their Thyatiran prophetess were; we recognize that the whole future of Christianity was at stake over this question; and we are struck once more with admiration at the unerring insight with which the Apostles gauged every question that presented itself in that complicated life of the period, and the quick sure decision with which they seized and insisted on the essential, and neglected the accidental and secondary aspects of the case. We can now understand why St. John condemns that very worthy, active, and managing, but utterly mistaken lady of Thyatira in such hard and cruel and, one might almost say, unfair language; he saw that she was fumbling about with questions which she was quite incapable of comprehending, full of complacent satisfaction with her superficial views as to the fairness

and reasonableness of allowing the poor to profit by those quite praiseworthy associations which did so much good (though containing some regrettable features which might easily be ignored by a philosophic mind), and misusing her influence, acquired by good works and persuasive speaking, to lead her fellow-Christians astray. If she were successful, Christianity must melt and be absorbed into the Graeco-Roman society, highly cultivated, but over-developed, morbid, unhealthy, "fast" (in modern slang). But she would not be successful. The mind which could see the Church's victory over the destroying Empire consummated in the death of every Christian had no fear of what the lady of Thyatira might do. "I will kill her children (i.e. her disciples and perverts) with death; ¹ and all the Churches shall know that I am he which searcheth the reins and hearts."

It was a hard and stern discipline, which undoubtedly left out some of the most charming, right and lovable sides of life and human nature; but it may be doubted if any less stern discipline could have availed to teach the existing world and bend it to the reign of law. It is a case similar to that of Scotland under the old Calvinistic régime, stern and hard and narrow; would any milder and more lovable rule ever have been able to tame a stubborn and self-willed race, among whom law had never been able to establish itself firmly?

And as to the prophetess, she had had long time to think and to learn wisdom; the question had been agitated for a great many years; but she had learned nothing and forgotten nothing, and only clung more closely to the policy of compromising with idolatry. Her end is expressed with a grim irony, which was probably far more full of meaning

¹ Probably death is here to be understood as "incurable disease," according to the universal belief that disease (and especially fever, in which there is no obvious affection of any organ) was the weapon of Divine power.

to the Thyatirans than to modern readers: there are allusions in the passage that escape us. She should have her last great sacrificial meal at one of those associations. "I set her on a dining-couch, and her vile associates with her, and they shall have opportunity to enjoy—great tribulation: unless *they* repent, for *she* has shown that she cannot repent." ¹

Probably, part of the effect of this denunciation depends on the ancient custom and usage as regards women. Though women had in many respects a position of considerable freedom in Anatolian cities, as has been pointed out by many writers, yet it may be doubted whether ladies in good society took part in the club-dinners. We do not know enough on the subject, however, to speak with any confidence; and can only express the belief that the status of ladies in the Lydian cities lent point to this passage. Possibly for her to be thus set down at the table was equivalent to saying that in her own life she would show the effect of the principles which she taught others to follow, and would sit at the revels like one of the light women. ²

It may be regarded as certain that the importance of the trade guilds in Thyatira made the Nicolaitan doctrine very popular there. The guilds were very numerous in that city, and are often mentioned in great variety in the inscriptions. It was, certainly, hardly possible for a tradesman to maintain his business in Thyatira without belonging to the guild of his trade. The guilds were corporate bodies, taking active measures to

¹ The meaning of this passage is quite misrepresented in the Authorized and Revised Versions, see EXPOSITOR, l.c.

² That women were members of religious associations (though not, apparently, in great numbers), is of course well known; but that is only the beginning of the question. What was their position and rule of life? How far did they take part in the meal and revel that followed the sacrifice?

protect the common interests, owning property, passing decrees, and exercising considerable powers; they also, undoubtedly, were benefit societies, and in many respects healthy and praiseworthy associations. In no other city are they so conspicuous. It was therefore a serious thing for a Thyatiran to cut himself off from his guild.

To the remnant of the Thyatiran Church—those who, while not rejecting the prophetess, and showing clearly that they “hated the works of the Nicolaitans,” had not actively carried out her teaching in practice—one word was sufficient. It was sufficient that they should follow the established principle, and act according to the law as stated in the Apostolic council at Jerusalem. No burden beyond that was laid upon them; but that teaching they must obey, and that burden they must bear, until the coming of the Lord.¹

W. M. RAMSAY.

¹ Like the preceding article this one had to be written far from books, and the writer must apologize for any inaccuracies. It has been printed necessarily without proper revision of the sheets.

TRANSLATIONS FROM THE PROPHETS.

XI.

JEREMIAH XLVI.—XLVIII.

Jeremiah's Prophecies against the Nations.

XLVI. ¹ That which came as Yahweh's word * unto Jeremiah the prophet concerning the nations.

² Of Egypt.

Concerning the army of Pharaoh Necho king of Egypt, which was by the river Euphrates in Carchemish, which Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon † smote in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, the son of Josiah, king of Judah.

Pharaoh Necho (b.c. 610-594), an ambitious and aspiring prince, essayed to add Syria, and the neighbouring parts of Asia, W. of the Euphrates, to his dominions. As he was marching through Palestine to effect his purpose, Josiah, attempting to turn him back, met his death at Megiddo (b.c. 609). Three months later Necho is mentioned as being at Riblah, in the land of Hamath, some seventy miles N. of Damascus (see 2 Kings 23. 29, 33). Some years afterwards (b.c. 605), he set out with a large army, and joined battle with Nabopolassar, the king of Babylon, at Carchemish, the great commercial city and fortress, commanding the principal ford of the Euphrates, by which armies marching to and fro between Babylon and Palestine, or Egypt, regularly crossed the river, about 260 miles N.N.E. of Damascus. There his army was completely defeated by Nebuchadrezzar, acting as general for his father, Nabopolassar. This defeat of the Egyptians at Carchemish was politically the turning-point of the age. Jeremiah at once saw that the Chaldeans were destined to become the rulers of Western Asia (cf. ch. 25); and his sense of this led him to come forward with the doctrine,—which to many of his fellow-countrymen seemed unpatriotic,—that the safety of Judah was to be found in submission to the Chaldean supremacy (21. 1-10; 27. 5-8, 12, etc.).

The present group of prophecies, except the one on Elam (49. 34-39), which is assigned by its title to a later period, in so far as they are really Jeremiah's, ‡ reflect the impression which Nebuchadrezzar's successes

* Cf. 14. 1; and see the note, May, 1903, p. 367.

† Nebuchadrezzar was not yet actually 'king' of Babylon, though he became so a few months afterwards; see my *Daniel* (in the *Cambridge Bible*), pp. xlix., 2.

‡ For most recent authorities on Jeremiah, including even A. B. Davidson (*D.B.* ii. 573b), are of opinion, chiefly upon grounds of differences of literary style, that chaps. 45-49 are either wholly (Stade, Wellh., Duhm), or in part (Giesebrecht, Cornill, Kuenen, Davidson), not Jeremiah's.

made upon the prophet: he pictures not only Egypt, but also the Philistines, Moab, Ammon, Edom, Damascus (all of whom had in the past been often unfriendly to Israel), and also the more distant Kedar, as one after another succumbing helplessly before the invader. Chapter 25 may be regarded as an introduction to these prophecies: it acquaints the reader with Jeremiah's general view of the political situation, which is then illustrated, and poetically developed, with reference to particular countries, in the present prophecies. Probably, in the original form of the book of Jeremiah, these prophecies followed immediately after chapter 25, from which they are now separated by the mainly biographical matter contained in chapters 26-45.

Vv. 3-12. An Ode of Triumph over the Defeat of the Egyptians by Nebuchadrezzar at Carchemish. Let the Warriors arm themselves, and advance to the Fight!

³ Set in line the buckler and shield, and draw near to battle! ⁴ Harness the horses, and mount the chargers, and stand forth with your helmets! furbish the lances, put on the coats of mail!

Hardly has the Prophet said these Words, when he sees the Egyptians already in Flight.

⁵ Wherefore do I see them to be dismayed,* and turned backwards? their mighty men † also are beaten down, and are fled apace, and look not back: terror is on every side! ‡ saith Yahweh. ⁶ Let not the swift flee away, nor the

Gieseb. accepts only chaps. 47. 49. 7-8, 10-11, and perhaps 13, and a nucleus in 46. 3-12. But, though the prophecies may have been amplified in parts by a later hand (or hands), it is doubtful whether there are sufficient reasons for reducing the original nucleus to such small dimensions as these. Kuenen (*Einl.* § 56. 9-11) accepted the whole, except 46. 27 f. (repeated from 30. 10 f., which is certainly their more original position: they would be appropriate in a prophecy written *after* the exile had begun), and certain parts of ch. 48 (see the notes on this chapter). Cornill (*Einl.* ed. 3, § 25. 9-10; and in his *Jeremiah* in Haupt's *Sacred Books of the O.T.*) agrees substantially with Kuenen. (Ch. 50. 1-51. 58 is generally recognized as not being from Jeremiah's hand.)

* The Heb. is unusual (yet see Ps. 9. 21); and perhaps we should read with LXX. *Wherefore are they dismayed?*

† I.e. their warriors. So *vv.* 6, 9, 12.

‡ Cf. 6. 25.

mighty man escape ! northward by the river Euphrates have they stumbled and fallen !

Egypt's boasts of Conquest will come to Nought : in vain will she endeavour to recover herself after her Defeat.

⁷ Who is this that riseth up like the Nile, whose waters toss themselves like the streams ? ⁸ Egypt riseth up like the Nile, and [his] * waters toss themselves like the streams ; and he saith, ' I will rise up, † I will cover the earth ; I will destroy the city and the inhabitants thereof. ⁹ Go up, ye horses ; and rage, ye chariots ; and let the mighty men go forth : Cush ‡ and Put, § that handle the shield ; and the Ludim, || that handle and bend the bow. ¶ ¹⁰ But that day belongeth to the Lord, Yahweh of hosts, a day of vengeance, that he may avenge him of his adversaries ; and the sword ** shall devour and be satiate, and shall drink its fill of †† their blood : for the Lord, Yahweh of hosts, hath a sacrifice in the north country by the river Euphrates. ¹¹ Go up into Gilead, and take balm, O virgin daughter of Egypt : in vain hast thou multiplied medicines ; there is no plaister for thee. ††† ¹² The nations have heard of thy shame, and the earth is full of thy cry : for the mighty man hath stumbled against the mighty, they are fallen both of them together.

¹³ The word that Yahweh spake to Jeremiah the prophet,

* The pronoun, which has accidentally fallen out, must be supplied.

† So with a change of points. The Heb. text, as pointed, has *bring up*.

‡ I.e. the Ethiopians : cf. Gen. 10. 6, 7.

§ I.e. the Libyans ; cf. Gen. 10. 6 ; Nah. 3. 9 ; Ezek. 27. 10 ; 30. 5.

|| Probably the name of a people dwelling on or near the W. border of Egypt : cf. Gen. 10. 13 ; Ezek. 27. 10 ; 30. 5. The three names are those of nations which furnished contingents to the Egyptian army (cf. Nah. 3. 9 ; Ezek. 30. 5).

¶ The prophet in this verse ironically bids the Egyptians begin the attack with all their forces ; they will avail them nothing.

** I.e. the sword of the Chaldeans, which will annihilate the Egyptian army. For the expressions, cf. Isa. 34. 5, 6, 8.

†† Lit. *be soaked or saturated with* (cf. Isa. 34. 5, 7). See the note on 31. 14.

††† Cf., for the expressions in this verse, 8. 22, 30. 13.

how that Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon should come and smite the land of Egypt.

The Victorious Chaldeans now press on into Egypt; and the Prophet, under various Figures, depicts the Collapse of the Power of Egypt before them.

¹⁴ Declare ye [in Egypt, and publish (it)] in Migdol, and publish (it) in Noph [and in Tahpanhes]: * say ye, 'Stand forth, † and prepare thee; for the sword hath devoured round about thee.' ¹⁵ Wherefore is thy strong one ‡ dashed down? he stood not, § because Yahweh did thrust him. ¹⁶ He || made many to stumble, yea, they fell one upon another: and they said, ¶ 'Arise, and let us go again to our own people, and to the land of our nativity, from the oppressing sword.' ¹⁷ Call ye the name of ** Pharaoh king

* The bracketed words (which mar the symmetry and rhythm of the verse, and are not expressed in the LXX.) are probably later explanatory additions to the original text. Migdol and Tahpanhes (called by the Greeks Daphnae) were border cities of Egypt, in the direction of Asia; Noph (i.e. Memphis) was the capital of Lower Egypt (near the modern Cairo). Cf. 44. 1.

† I.e., take thy stand to resist the invader (cf. 2 Sam. 23. 12 'stood').

‡ I.e., thy *bull* (see, for the meaning, Ps. 22. 12b, 'the strong ones of Bashan,' i.e. the *bulls* of Bashan), with allusion to Apis, the sacred bull of the Egyptians. The Mass. text has *thy strong ones* (i.e. *thy steeds*, as S. 16, 47. 3); but more than 50 Heb. MSS. LXX. Aq. Symm. Theod. Vulg. have *thy strong one* (the difference in the Heb. is very slight, and the verb *dashed down* and following pronouns are all singular).

§ The LXX., reading what is now one word (נסחף) as two (נס חף) have, *Wherefore is Apis fled?* *Thy strong one* [paraphrased in LXX. by *Thy choice calf*] *stood not*, etc.

|| I.e. Yahweh. See, however, the next note.

¶ Read probably (from the beginning of the verse), *Thy mixed people* (ערבך for הרבה) *have stumbled* (so LXX.) *and fallen*; and *they said one to another* (the transposition, as LXX.). The words following speak of a return of *foreigners* to their own country, of whom in the existing Heb. text there has been no mention. The 'mixed people' will be either foreign traders settled in Egypt, or foreign mercenaries serving in the Egyptian army: see ch. 25. 20, with the note.

** So LXX. (merely changes of punctuation). The Heb. text, as pointed, has, *They called there*.

of Egypt a Crash ; * he hath let the appointed time † pass by. ¹⁸ As I live, saith the King, whose name is Yahweh of hosts, Surely there shall come one like Tabor among the mountains, and like Carmel in the sea. ‡ ¹⁹ O thou daughter that dwellest in Egypt, § furnish thyself to go into exile : || for Noph shall become a desolation, and shall be burnt up without inhabitant.

²⁰ Egypt is a pretty heifer ; but a gad-fly from the north is come upon her. ¶ ²¹ Also her hired soldiers in the midst of her, which be like calves of the stall, ** yea they also are turned back, they are fled away together, they did not stand : for the day of their calamity is come upon them, the time of their visitation. ²² Her sound is like the serpent's, as it goeth ; †† for with an army shall they march, and with axes shall they come against her, as gatherers of (fire-)wood. ²³ They shall cut down ‡‡ her forest, §§ saith Yahweh, for it cannot be searched out ; because they ||| are

* Pharaoh is to be called by a name symbolical of a great disaster (cf. 20. 3) : cf. for the word ch. 25. 31 (where 'noise' of A.V., R.V., is very inadequate) ; Hos. 10. 14 and Am. 2. 2 (of the roar or din of battle : A.V., R.V., 'tumult').

† I.e. the time when he might have averted the disaster. But the correctness of the text is open to suspicion.

‡ I.e. a foe (Nebuchadrezzar), towering above all others.

§ I.e. the population of Egypt, personified.

|| Lit. *get thee articles for exile* ; i.e. collect thy household articles, dress, provisions, cooking utensils, etc., preparatory to going into exile. The same expression is rendered in Ezek. 12. 3, *prepare thee stuff for removing* (R.V.m. *for exile*).

¶ So LXX. Pesh. Targ. Vulg. (הב for נב). The Heb. text repeats *is come*. The 'gad-fly' is, of course, a figure for the Chaldeans.

** I.e. well-nourished.

†† I.e. inaudible, so weak and powerless will Egypt have then become.

‡‡ Heb. *have cut down*—a 'prophetic' perfect, like *are come* (Heb.) in v. 22, and the two verbs in v. 24.

§§ Egypt, with its many populous and flourishing cities (Herod. ii. 177, cf. 60), is compared to a forest (cf. Isa. 10. 18, 19, 33, 34, of the Assyrian army), so thick that the only means of finding a way through it is by cutting it down.

||| I.e. the host of the invaders.

more than the locusts, and are innumerable. ²⁴ Put to shame is the daughter of Egypt! she is given into the hand of the people of the north! ²⁵ Yahweh of hosts, the God of Israel, saith: Behold, I will punish Amon of No,* [and Pharaoh, and Egypt, and her gods, and her kings,†] and Pharaoh, and them that trust in him: ²⁶ and I will deliver them into the hand of those that seek their lives, and into the hand of Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon, and into the hand of his servants; and afterward it shall be inhabited,‡ as in the days of old, saith Yahweh.

A Message of Encouragement, addressed to Israel. §

²⁷ But thou, fear thou not, O Jacob, my servant; neither be dismayed, O Israel: for, lo, I will save thee from afar, and thy seed from the land of their captivity; and Jacob shall return, and shall be in rest and at ease, and none shall make him afraid. ²⁸ Fear not thou, O Jacob, my servant, saith Yahweh; for I am with thee: for I will make a full end of all the nations whither I have driven thee, yet of thee will I not make a full end: but I will correct thee with judgment,|| and will in no wise leave thee unpunished.¶

* I.e. Thebes, the capital of Upper Egypt, mentioned also in Nah. 3. 8, Ezek. 30. 14, 15, 16. Amon was the tutelary god of Thebes: cf. Nah. 3. 8.

† The bracketed words are not expressed in LXX.; and are almost certainly a supplementing gloss, like the two in v. 14. (Notice the following 'and Pharaoh,' producing, if the preceding 'Pharaoh' be correct, an intolerable tautology: 'even' in A.V., R.V., is not a legitimate rendering of the Hebrew.)

‡ Heb. *shall dwell*: cf. on 17. 25. The prophecy closes with a promise of ultimate restoration: cf. 48. 47, 49. 6, 39.

§ These two verses are repeated, with slight verbal differences, from 30. 10, 11, where they suit the context well, and also the date (*after* the fall of Jerusalem, B.C. 586). They can hardly have been placed here by Jer. himself, at least in the year 604 B.C.; for they imply that the exile has begun, and are alien to the tone in which in that year (see ch. 25) Jer. was expressing himself.

|| Or, *in measure*: see on 30. 11.

¶ Or, *hold thee guiltless*.

XLVII. ¹ That which came as Yahweh's word unto Jeremiah the prophet concerning the Philistines, before that Pharaoh smote Gaza.

*How the Land of the Philistines will be wasted by the Chaldeans.**

² Thus saith Yahweh : Behold, waters rise up out of the north, and shall become an overflowing torrent, and they shall overflow the land and all that is therein, the city and them that dwell therein : and the men shall cry, and all the inhabitants of the land shall howl. ³ At the noise of the galloping of the hoofs of his steeds,† at the rattling of his chariots, at the rumbling of his wheels, the fathers look not back to their children for feebleness ‡ of hands ; ⁴ because of the day that cometh to spoil all the Philistines, to cut off from Tyre and Zidon every helper that surviveth : for Yahweh is spoiling the Philistines, the remnant of the isle § of Caphtor.|| ⁵ Baldness ¶ is come upon Gaza ; Ashkelon is brought to nought : O remnant of the Anaḳim,**

* When Pharaoh smote Gaza is not certainly known (see the Commentators). It is possible that the title—or at least the last clause of it—is the incorrect addition of one who saw in Necho's conquest of Gaza the fulfilment of *v.* 5, and hence identified wrongly—for the 'waters rising out of the north' can certainly denote only the Chaldeans—the foe who was to smite the Philistines with the Egyptians. The LXX. for the whole of *v.* 1 have only *Upon the Philistines*.

† Lit. *his strong ones* (poet. for war-horses, as 8. 14, Jud. 5. 22).

‡ Lit. *sinking or dropping down* ; cf. 6. 24.

§ Or, *coast-land*. The Heb. word may denote either : cf. Gen. 10. 5.

|| I.e. either Crete or (*Enc. Bibl.* s.v.) Cilicia. Mentioned here as the home of the Philistines : see Am. 9. 7, Deut. 2. 23.

¶ A mark of mourning : cf. 16. 6, Deut. 14. 1, Mic. 1. 16.

** So LXX. (עַנְקִים for עַנְקִים). The Heb. text has *their vale*, which is unsuited to the context. The 'Anāḳim were a giant race, who were supposed to have dwelt in or near Hebron in prehistoric times (Num. 13. 22, 28 ; Josh. 11. 21, 14. 12, 15, 15. 13, 14=Jud. 1. 20), and also in the Philistine country ; see Jos. 11. 22, which explains the expression used here. (N.B. 'Anak' [A.V., R.V.] in the Heb. has nearly always the article, showing that it is not the name of an individual but of the people.)

how long wilt thou gash thyself? * ⁶ 'Ah, thou sword of Yahweh! how long will it be ere thou be quiet? put up thyself into thy scabbard; rest, and be still.' † ⁷ How can it ‡ be quiet, seeing Yahweh hath given it a charge? against Ashkelon, and against the sea shore, there hath he appointed it.

XLVIII. ¹ Of Moab.

The territory occupied by Moab was the elevated and rich plateau on the E. of the Dead Sea. Originally (Num. 21. 26) the Moabite territory extended as far N. as Heshbon, to the N.E. of the Dead Sea (see on *v.* 2); but the Israelites, after their conquest of the country E. of Jordan, considered the territory N. of the Arnon (which flows down through a deep gorge into the Dead Sea at about the middle of its E. side) to belong to Reuben (Josh. 13. 15–21), and regarded the Arnon as the N. border of Moab. But Reuben did not ultimately remain in possession of the district allotted to it; and so here, as in Isa. 15–16, many of the Reubenite cities are mentioned as being in the possession of Moab.

The desolating Invasion about to break upon Moab; and the Flight of its Population. §

Thus saith Yahweh of hosts, the God of Israel: Ah, for Nebo! || because it is spoiled; Kiriathaim is put to shame, it is taken: Misgab ¶ is put to shame and dismayed. ² The

* Another mark of mourning: see 16. 6, Deut. 14. 1.

† *V.* 6 may be supposed to express the cry of the Philistines for mercy.

‡ So LXX. Pesh. Vulg. The Heb. text (by false assimilation to *v.* 6) has, *canst thou*.

§ For most of the *places* mentioned in this chapter, see Num. 32. 3, 34–38, Jos. 13. 16–19, 21. 36–7, and Isaiah's prophecy on Moab, ch. 15–16. In *vv.* 5, 29–38, there are numerous verbal reminiscences from Isa. 15–16. The passages of this chapter which—chiefly on account of their lack of independence—Kuenen (see on 46. 1) regarded as later expansions of the original prophecy of Jeremiah are *vv.* 29–38; 40*b*, 41*b* (introduced from 49. 22; also not in LXX.); 43, 44*a* (see Isa. 24. 17*b*–18); 44*b* (Jer. 11. 23, 23. 12); 45, 46 (see Num. 21. 28, 24. 17, 21. 29: not in LXX.).

|| The city (Num. 32. 3, 38), not the better-known mountain (Deut. 34. 1).

¶ A place not elsewhere mentioned. The word means a *high retreat* (Isa. 25. 12, R.V. *high fort*); so it was doubtless the name of some fortress.

renown of Moab is no more; in Heshbon * they have devised evil against her, saying, 'Come, and let us cut her off from being a nation.' Also thou, O Madmen, † shalt be brought to silence; the sword shall follow after thee. ³ The sound of a cry from Horonaim, spoiling and great destruction! ‡ ⁴ Moab is destroyed; § they make a cry to be heard unto Zoar. || ⁵ For by the ascent of Luhith with weeping do they go up; ¶ for in the descent to Horonaim they have heard ** a cry of destruction. †† ⁶ Flee, save your lives, ‡‡ and be §§ like a juniper |||| in the wilderness. ⁷ For, because thou hast trusted in thy works ¶¶ and in thy treasures, thou

* An ancient and famous city on the E. of Jordan, about thirteen miles E. of the upper end of the Dead Sea: originally Moabite (Num. 21. 26), afterwards the capital of Sihon, king of the Amorites, allotted to Reuben (Jos. 13. 17), and now again in the possession of Moab (cf. Isa. 15. 4, 16. 8; 9). In the Heb. there is a play on the name in 'devised.' 'They' will be the foe, who must be supposed to have captured Heshbon.

† No place Madmen is elsewhere mentioned; perhaps, supposing a letter to have been written twice by error, we should read *Dimon* (גַּם דִּמּוֹן) for גַּם מִדְּמָן—in the old characters, there would be no difference between ד and מ), i.e. Dibon (cv. 18, 22)—spelt *Dimon*, for the sake of the assonance (in the Heb.) with 'be brought to silence,' as in Isa. 15. 9, for the sake of that with 'blood.'

‡ Heb. *breaking*. The word is a favourite one in Jeremiah: 4. 20, 6. 14, 8. 11, 21, 10. 19, 30. 12, 15; and with 'great' 4. 6, 6. 1, 14. 17, 50. 22, 51. 44.

§ Heb. *is broken*.

|| At the extreme S.E. of the Dead Sea (see ZOAR in *D.B.*). The cry of Moab is thus heard from one end of the land to another. *Even unto Zoar* is the reading of LXX.: the Heb. text has *her little ones*; but the change is very slight (צַעֲרִיָּה for צַעֲרָה).

¶ See Isa. 15. 5. The Heb. after 'go up' has, by error, *weeping* (subst.), בּוֹ בֵּי (as in Isa.) becoming בֵּי בֵּי,—probably through the influence of the preceding בֵּי.

** So LXX. The Heb. adds *the distresses of*; but the word is doubtless nothing but a corrupt anticipation of the following word.

†† Heb. *of breaking*.

‡‡ Heb. *your souls*.

§§ Heb. *let them be*,—the pron. referring to *your souls* (see the last note) equivalent to *your living persons*.

|||| I.e. (from its cropped and stunted appearance) stripped and desolate Comp. on 17. 6.

¶¶ I.e. thy undertakings, measures of defence, etc. But perhaps we should read with LXX. *thy strongholds* (one letter different).

also shalt be taken: and Chemosh* shall go forth into exile, his priests and his princes together. ⁸ And the spoiler shall come upon every city, and no city shall escape; the vale † also shall perish, and the table-land ‡ shall be destroyed, as Yahweh hath spoken. ⁹ Give wings unto Moab, for she would fain fly away; and her cities shall become a desolation, without any to dwell therein. ¹⁰ Cursed be he that doeth Yahweh's work negligently, and cursed be he that keepeth back his sword from blood!

Moab has for long been left unmolested in his Land; but now his Security will be rudely disturbed.

¹¹ Moab hath been at ease from his youth, and he is at rest upon his lees, and hath not been emptied from vessel to vessel, neither hath he gone into exile: therefore his taste § remaineth in him, and his scent § is not changed. ¹² Therefore, behold, the days come, saith Yahweh, that I will send unto him tilters, and they shall tilt him; and they shall empty his vessels, and dash their jars in pieces. ¹³ And Moab shall be put to shame through || Chemosh, as the house of Israel was put to shame through Bethel their

* The national god of Moab: cf. Num. 21. 29, 1 Kings 11. 7.

† Probably, as in Josh. 13. 19, 27, the broad depression into which the Jordan-valley opens as it approaches the Dead Sea.

‡ The *Mishōr* (or 'plain-country'), the regular name of the extensive elevated plateau (c. 2500 ft. above the Medit. Sea), on which most of the Moabite cities lay: cf. Deut. 3. 10; Josh. 13. 9, 16, 17, 21.

§ I.e. his national character, his spirit of haughty independence (Isa. 16. 6, v. 29 below).

|| Or, as we should say, *be disappointed by*; viz., through the expected help not being given. The idea of the word is that of being *disconcerted* by the frustration of one's plans or hopes, the prep. following (lit. *from*) denoting the source whence the disappointment comes. Comp. 2. 36, 14. 3; Isa. 20. 5; Job 6. 20. The meaning is not 'to be ashamed of' (A.V., R.V.) as we should understand the expression. See further the glossary in my *Parallel Psalter*, p. 438.

confidence.* ¹⁴ How say ye, 'We are mighty men, and valiant men for the war?' ¹⁵ Moab is laid waste, and they are gone up † into his ‡ cities, § and the flower || of his young men are gone down to the slaughter saith the King, whose name is Yahweh of hosts. ¹⁶ The calamity of Moab is near to come, and his affliction hasteth fast. ¹⁷ Bemoan him, all ye that are round about him, and all ye that know his name; say, 'How is the strong staff ¶ broken, the beautiful rod!' ¶ ¹⁸ Come down from (thy) glory, and sit in thirst, O thou daughter,** that inhabitest Dibon; †† for the spoiler of Moab is come up against thee, he hath destroyed thy fortresses. ¹⁹ Stand by the way, and watch, §§ O inhabitress of Aroer; ||| ask him that fleeth, and her that escapeth; say, 'What hath been done?'

Moab is utterly crushed and helpless; the entire Country is at the Invader's Feet.

²⁰ Moab is put to shame; for it is dismayed: howl and cry; tell ye it by the Arnon, that Moab is laid waste. ²¹ And judgement is come upon the table-land: upon Holon and upon Jahzah, and upon Mephaath, ²² and upon Dibon,

* Cf. Amos 5. 5.

† Heb. *one is gone up*.

‡ So LXX. The Heb. text has *her*.

§ Read perhaps, with Giesebrecht, *and his cities are fallen*. (The form of the Hebrew sentence suggests that there is some error in the text.)

|| Heb. *the choice*.

¶ Figures of strength and authority.

** Fig. for the population (as in 'daughter of Zion,' etc.). So 'inhabitress' in *v.*

†† 13 miles E. of the Dead Sea, and 4 miles N. of the Arnon—the place at which the famous 'Moabite stone' was found in 1868.

§§ Cf. 1 Sam. 3. 13.

||| 4 miles SSE. of Dibon (but 1,500 feet below it: see G. A. Smith's large map of Palestine), just on the N. edge of the deep chasm through which the Arnon flows.

and upon Nebo, and upon Beth-diblathaim,²³ and upon Kiriathaim, and upon Beth-gamul, and upon Beth-meon,²⁴ and upon Keriyioth, and upon Bozrah,* and upon all the cities of the land of Moab, far or near.²⁵ The horn † of Moab is hewn off, and his arm is broken, saith Yahweh.²⁶ Make ye him drunken, ‡ for he hath magnified himself against Yahweh; and let Moab splash into his vomit, § and let him also be in derision.²⁷ Or was Israel not a derision unto thee? or was he found among thieves, that as often as thou spakest of him, thou didst wag the head? ||²⁸ Leave the cities, and dwell in the crags, O ye inhabitants of Moab, and be like the dove that maketh her nest in the sides of the hole's mouth. ¶

* The 'Bezer' of Deut. 4. 43, Josh. 20. 8, 21. 36. (Not the 'Bozrah' of 49. 13, Isa. 63. 1, which was in Edom.)

† A figure for *power*: cf. Ps. 75. 10; Lam. 2. 3, 17.

‡ I.e. let him be bewildered by terror and despair. For this fig. sense of 'drunkenness,' cf. the note on 25. 15 f.

§ A further trait in Moab's helplessness: cf. ch. 25. 27.

|| I.e. was Israel like a detected thief, for thee to wag thy head (Ps. 64. 8: lit. *shake thyself*) at him in mockery?

¶ Alluding to the inaccessible crevices and fissures, high up the rocky sides of the defiles and gorges of Palestine—including, in particular, the gorge of the Arnon—in which innumerable doves make their nests. See Tristram, *Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, p. 215; and cf. Cant. 2. 14.

NOTES.

XLVI. 3. *Set in line*. This, of course, is the meaning of A.V., R.V., 'order,' which in Old English means to 'set in order,' 'arrange.' But this sense of the verb is now obsolete; and it is to be feared that the majority of Englishmen, when they read (or hear) 'he shall *order* the lamps upon the pure candlestick (Lev. 24. 4), 'build an altar in the *ordered* place' (Jud. 6. 26 A.V.), 'Who shall *order* the battle' (1 Kings 20. 14 A.V.), '*Order* my steps in thy word' (Ps. 119. 133), or here, '*Order* ye the buckler and shield,' suppose that the meaning in each case is 'command,' 'give directions for,' whereas it is, in fact, 'set in order,' 'arrange,' or (Ps. 119) 'dispose.' Cf. Hastings, *D.B.*, s.v. ORDER.

15. *Dashed down*. The sense of סָחַף is clear from Syriac, in which the same word is used, for instance, to express הָרַם (Jud. 6. 25), or ἐδαφίζω (Luke 19. 42). Prov. 28. 3 is thus properly '*a prostrating rain.*'

16. The emendation is Giesebrecht's, and it has been accepted by Duhm. The rendering of LXX. presupposes it partly (*καὶ τὸ πλῆθος σου = יְרֵבֶרֶךְ*).

20. *Pretty*. Heb. יפה-פיה, divided incorrectly into two words (cf. Isa. 2. 20, 61. 1): read יְפִיפִיָּה—of course, upon the assumption that there is no deeper corruption (possibly we should read יָפָה 'fair,' alone). The precise force of the reduplication (if correct) is uncertain (see Ewald, § 157 *c*; Stade, p. 159; G.-K. § 84 (*b*) *n*, cf. 55*e*); but it seems, on the whole, more probable that it has a diminutive, caritative force ('pretty') than that it is a mere intensive ('very fair').

XLVIII. 6. For a fem. pl. (תהיינה), referring to a singular noun, to be understood collectively (נפשכם), cf. Isa. 27. 11, and with pronouns Gen. 30. 37 (בהן referring to כל), Jud. 19. 12, Jer. 4. 29, and with צא regularly (e.g. Gen. 30. 38): cf. G.-K. § 145. 2.

9. *wings . . . fly away*. The meaning of both words can hardly be said to be certain: צי is not found elsewhere with the meaning 'wings,' and נצא occurs only (in the form נצה) in a passage where the reading is open to question (Lam. 4. 15): but the sense is good, and nothing better has hitherto been proposed. The combination תצא תצא, 'go forth with a flying,' is, however, so contrary to Heb. usage (cf. G.-K. § 113*w*, note) that there can be little hesitation in pointing תצא תצא, 'fly away.'

19. *and her that escapeth* (perfect in pause). On the construction (which is delicate), see my *Tenses*, § 117 *Obs.*, G.-K. § 112 *n* (where, however, this passage is not cited). For the variation in the gender, cf. Isa. 11. 12 (Heb.).

27. דברך. Read with Giesebrecht דְּבַרְךָ; cf. 31. 20, 1 Sam. 1. 7, etc.

S. R. DRIVER.

*THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE EPISTLE TO THE
HEBREWS.*

[In this article the contractions *á. λ.* and *á. λλ.* are used to save space, and, unless otherwise stated, are to be taken as meaning that the word or words thus marked are limited, not absolutely to the books in which they are found, but to these books within the New Testament, and without considering the question of their occurrence once or more than once within these limits.]

IN approaching the question as to the authorship of the great anonymous Epistle (which is unique not only in its anonymity, but also in its position as the only systematic theological treatise in the New Testament) one feels oneself embarrassed by many difficulties. Through the very age of the lock the key seems to have rusted in the wards. There is nothing approaching to a consensus of either ancient tradition or modern criticism on the subject.

To sum up briefly the results of ancient and modern inquiry, we may say that this great Epistle has been assigned to five different authors: S. Paul, S. Barnabas, S. Clement, S. Luke, and Apollos. There is no one else whose claim to the authorship is worthy of the slightest consideration. And it is more likely that the author was some one of these five than some "great Unknown," who left this great impression on Apostolic or sub-Apostolic theology, and no other mark whatsoever.

On close examination three of these claims vanish. The claims of Apollos seem to rest on a mere guess of Luther's, apparently based on the facts that Apollos was eloquent and learned in the Scriptures, qualities by no means unique in the Apostolic age. The claims of Barnabas and Clement seem to rest solely on certain resemblances between *Hebrews* and epistles written by or attributed to these authors. But these resemblances are purely on the surface, and seem to me to suggest simply an acquaintance with our epistle on

the part of these writers. This, joined to a dissimilarity of thought that is deeper and stronger than the resemblances, is actually an argument against *Hebrews* having come from either of these sources.¹

Two names remain, those of S. Paul and S. Luke. Is there any good ground for attributing the Epistle to either?

It is unnecessary to dwell at any length on the arguments for the Pauline authorship. We may grant that the style is in some respects like S. Paul's; that the vocabulary resembles his vocabulary; that, like S. Paul (and to a greater degree), the author has a peculiar affection for active verbal substantives; that the "Hymn of Faith" reminds one of a well known passage in the Epistle to the Romans; that a curious misquotation, "Vengeance is Mine, I will repay," is common to *Romans* and *Hebrews*; that *Hebrews* has the Pauline peculiarity of division into two sections, the first theological and the second practical; and that the concluding section is couched—as Canon Ashwell² points out—in a form that S. Paul seems (2 *Thess.* iii. 17) to claim as peculiarly his own.

But against these points must be set certain plain facts. The dissimilarity of style between the books admitted to be Pauline and *Hebrews* is at least as strong as the resemblance—S. Paul's vocabulary was subject to outside influences—and the vocabulary of *Hebrews* has marked pecu-

¹ The "Epistle of Barnabas" is a wild and exaggerated piece of typology, which (it has been said) "makes the Old Testament a riddle, and the New Testament its answer." One may be excused for using the "Lemprière Hypothesis," and suggesting that there were probably two persons of the name! There is no evidence that the genuine S. Barnabas was in any way connected with the writing of *Hebrews*. S. Clement's Epistle, on the other hand, deals with "Faith and Hospitality," in a manner that distinctly suggests acquaintance with the persons or writings of S. Paul and S. Peter—an interesting point when taken in connexion with Professor Ramsay's views as to the Petrine Episcopate at Rome and of the connexion of S. Clement with that see.

² S.P.C.K. Commentary.

liarities of its own. S. Paul is by no means alone in his love of active verbals. "Faith" means one thing in the Epistle to the Romans and quite another in our Epistle. We all know that quotations are frequently current in inaccurate forms.¹ The division of an epistle into theological and doctrinal sections is eminently natural and eminently useful; it is as strongly marked in 1 *Peter* (which, by the way, has a distinct resemblance to *Hebrews*) as in any Epistle of S. Paul's. Finally, Canon Ashwell's argument presupposes a circulation of the Pauline writings that seems improbable at so early a period, and it ignores the fact that the word *χάρις* (the supposed hall-mark of Pauline authorship) is at least as characteristic of S. Luke and of the Petrine Epistles.

And the case against the Pauline authorship seems unanswerable. The anonymity is remarkable—all the more so because its adoption was obviously not intended to conceal the personality of the author. S. Paul could not have described himself as simply a learner from those who had heard our Lord. S. Paul was a Stoic, naturally, being a Pharisee; he not only gives us Stoic thought, but conveys it in the technical language of the Porch. But the author of our Epistle (as I think I have fully proved in an article in *Hermathena*) was distinctly a Platonist. Finally, the Epistle can hardly have been written during the lifetime of S. Paul. It is true that the writer always uses the present tense in speaking of the Jewish worship; but, on the other

¹ In quoting the line of Borbonius,

"Omnia mutantur, nos et mutamur in illis,"

many reverse the position of "nos" and "et," and a still larger number of persons substitute "Tempora" for "Omnia." Cowper's line,

"The cups that cheer and not inebriate,"

is frequently quoted in the form,

"The cup that cheers but not inebriates."

Would any sane critic consider that the presence of the incorrect forms of either of these quotations in two books was any proof of community of authorship?

hand, the worship alluded to is always that of the Tabernacle. Thus the present tense describes an ideal, historical present; and the whole tone of thought in our Epistle makes it highly improbable that it was written until some years after the death of S. Paul.

Of the five names mentioned one remains—that of S. Luke. Is there any distinct and positive evidence to support the view, already suggested by a dialectic and negative process, that this great treatise came from his pen? To clear the ground, let us notice two or three points at starting.

First, several of the arguments used in favour of the Pauline authorship are quite as strongly in favour of S. Luke. There is a resemblance between their styles and their vocabularies. Both are particularly fond of active verbals. Both abound in *ἀ. λλ.*, and these *ἀ. λλ.* are notably present among their active verbals.

Secondly, we have seen that there are special reasons which make it practically impossible to refer the Epistle to the Hebrews to S. Paul. Now, none of these objections applies to S. Luke. He has written other books—anonymously; elsewhere he definitely describes himself as a learner from others; there is no ground for believing him to have been a Pharisee, or in any way imbued with Stoicism.

From these two considerations we see that *all such arguments for the Pauline authorship of an Epistle as may also be applied to S. Luke become arguments for the Lucan authorship, since they are not affected, in his case, by the objections that make it impossible to apply them to S. Paul.*

Thirdly, we have a consideration that cannot be omitted, though its use lies not so much in its direct evidential value as in the help it gives us in confirming conclusions reached in other ways. S. Paul was subject to influences outside his own special personality—the influence of his

companions, the influence of his scribes. Among his scribes and companions we must reckon S. Luke. S. Luke, again, was subject to varying influences—the Synoptic tradition, the other sources from which he obtained information as to the *individual* parts of his Gospel, which, by the way, form more than half of its contents. Now, we are justified in supposing that when S. Paul was most likely to be affected by the personal influence of S. Luke he would show the strongest traces of Lucan peculiarities, and also that when S. Luke was working either without documents or with documents that were not written in Greek he would show us most strongly his individuality of style. Bearing this in mind, there are a few points that will repay careful consideration. (1) Among S. Paul's acknowledged writings there is one holograph—the Epistle to the Galatians. It shows hardly a trace of the peculiarities common to S. Paul and S. Luke. Notably, it is remarkably deficient in active verbal substantives, and does not contain a single word of this class that is not found elsewhere in the New Testament. (2) So, too, the most individual portion of S. Luke's Gospel is the section immediately following the Introduction—the Gospel of the Childhood: Here his authorities were obviously Aramaic, so we might naturally expect that the Greek would show his peculiar style most markedly. Now, in no part of the Third Gospel or *Acts* do we find so many active verbals as in this particular section. So far, then, we have grounds for believing that the lavish use of active verbals in S. Paul's Epistles was probably due to the influence of S. Luke; and, as words of this class are more numerous in *Hebrews* than in any Pauline document, this deduction is obviously of some value in determining the authorship of our Epistle. So, too, there are other peculiarities common to S. Paul and S. Luke—such as the use of distinctively medical words—that can be best explained by supposing them to be due

to the influence of the latter writer. If these peculiarities also abound in *Hebrews*, surely this fact indicates S. Luke as the writer rather than his greater friend and companion, S. Paul.

Fourthly, we can to a certain extent find out at least the *minimum* limit of S. Luke's influence in the New Testament. When 1 *Timothy* was written he was S. Paul's sole companion, and there seems reason to believe that he was with S. Paul during the writing of all three Pastoral Epistles. He sends a greeting to the Colossians. There seems good reason to believe that he was present during the writing of 2 *Corinthians*. 1 *Peter* (almost certainly a translation) has a remarkable resemblance to his style. The Greek of 2 *Peter* is grammatically sound, but barbarous in phraseology; it is however sufficiently like the good Greek of 1 *Peter* and of S. Luke in general to suggest that the writer took as his style that of S. Luke. There is, in fact, sufficient ground for believing that these books—*Colossians*, 2 *Corinthians*, the Pastoral Epistles, *First* (and, to a lesser extent, *Second*) *Peter*,—possess a Lucan character, to justify us in treating them as "Secondary Lucan works," and in using them as a help in determining the authorship of *Hebrews*.

For the present, however, it will be sufficient to examine our Epistle simply in connexion with the acknowledged Lucan writings—the Third Gospel and *Acts*.

Now these two books have certain remarkable peculiarities. They abound in *ἀ. λλ.*; they have a large common vocabulary; they are specially strong in active verbals, many of which occur once only; and their individually or collectively peculiar words can be largely traced to the same sources. Speaking generally, we may say that they contain in their vocabulary a large and peculiar element of philosophical, medical, and—to a less extent—technical legal terms; and we may add that these terms show a dis-

tinct acquaintance with a special series of books, with the writings of Plato, Aristotle's *Physics* and *Ethics*, Hippocrates and other medical authorities, and also with Thucydides, Polybius, Theophrastus, Diodorus Siculus, and the Greek Tragedians. Aristophanes has also left his mark on the vocabulary, and there seems evidence that Philo and Plutarch drew from much the same sources. There are also clear traces of the influence of the LXX. and the Apocrypha. *En passant*, I may observe that the books which I have named "Secondary Lucan" show clear signs of the same influences. If, however, we can show a strong parallelism simply between the Epistle to the Hebrews and the two acknowledged works of S. Luke, we shall have done something towards determining the authorship of our Epistle.

ALEX. R. EAGAR.

(To be continued.)

THE LETTER TO THE CHURCH IN SARDIS.

THE analogy between the Ephesian and Sardian letters is close, and the two have to be studied together. History had moved on similar lines with the two Churches. Both had begun enthusiastically and cooled down. Degeneration was the fact in both ; but in Ephesus the degeneration had not yet become so serious as in Sardis. Hence in the Ephesian letters the keynote is merely change, instability and uncertainty ; in the Sardian letter the keynote is degradation, false pretension and death.

In those two letters the exordium takes a very similar form. To the Ephesian Church "these things saith he that holdeth the seven stars in his right hand, he that walketh between the seven golden candlesticks." To the Sardian Church the letter proceeds from him "that hath the seven spirits of God and the seven stars." The sender of both letters stands forth as the centre, the pivot and the director of the Universal Church, and in particular of the entire group of the Asian Churches. Effective power exercised over the whole Church is emphasized in both cases, and especially in the Sardian address. The "Seven Spirits of God" must certainly be taken as a symbolic or allegorical way of indicating the full range of exercise of the Divine power in the Seven Churches, i.e. in the Universal Church as represented here by the Asian Churches. If one may try in inadequate and rough terms to express the meaning, the "Spirit of God" is to be understood as the power of God exerting itself practically in the Church ; and, since the

Church is always regarded in the Revelation as consisting of Seven parts or Churches, the power of God is described in its relation to those Seven parts as the "Seven Spirits of God."

This awkward and indirect way of expression (which is misleading if it be not sympathetically and carefully interpreted) is forced on the writer by the plan of his work, which does not aim at philosophic exposition, but at shadowing forth through sensuous imagery "the deep things of God," according to the crude literary form which he chose to imitate.

Under the phraseology, "the Seven Spirits of God," the writer of the Revelation conceals a statement of the great problem: "how does the Divine power make itself effective in regard to the world and mankind, when it is entirely different in nature and character from the common world of human experience? How can a thing act on another which is wholly different in nature from it, and lies on a different plane of existence?" The Divine power has to go forth, as it were, out of itself in order to reach mankind. The writer had evidently been occupying himself with this problem; and, as we see, the book of the Revelation is a vague and dim expression of the whole range of this and the associated problems regarding the relation of God to man. But the book is not to be taken as a solution of the problems. It is the work of a man who has not reached an answer, i.e. who has not yet succeeded in expressing the question in philosophic form, but who is struggling to body forth the problems before himself and his readers in such imagery as may make them more conceivable.

The most serious error in regard to the book of the Revelation consists in regarding it as a statement of the solution. No solution is reached in the book; but the writer's aim is to convey to his readers his own perfect

confidence that the Divine nature is effective on human nature and on the world of sense, all-powerful, absolutely victorious in this apparent contest with evil or anti-Christ ; that in fact there is not really any contest, for the victory is gained in the inception of the contest, and the seeming struggle is merely the means whereby the Divine power offers to man the opportunity of learning to understand its nature.

The Spirit of God, and still more the Seven Spirits of God, are therefore not to be taken as a description of the method by which the Divine activity exerts itself in its relation to the Church ; for, if looked at so, they are easily perverted and elaborated into a theory of intermediate powers intervening between God and the world, and thus there must arise the whole system of angels (which in human nature, as ideas and customs then tended, inevitably degenerated into a worship of angels, according to Colossians ii. 18 ; just as a few centuries later the respect for the saints and martyrs of the Church degenerated into a worship of them as powers intervening between man and the remote ultimate Divine nature). The Seven Spirits form simply an expression suited to reach the comprehension of men at that time, and make them image to themselves the activity of God in relation to the Seven Churches, and to the whole Universal Church. That this is a successful attempt to present the problem to human apprehension cannot be maintained. The book is the first attempt of a writer struggling to express great ideas ; but the ideas have not yet been thought out clearly in his mind and he has been led away to imitate a crude and bad model fashionable in Jewish circles at the time. He has reached an infinitely higher level than any other of that class known to us ; but there are ineradicable faults in the whole class.

The Church of Sardis, then, is addressed by Him who controls and directs the Divine action in the Churches as

they exist in the world, and who holds in his hand the Seven Churches, with their history and their destiny. This expression of His power is varied from that which occurs in the address of the Ephesian letter, of course in a way suited to the Sardian Church, though it is not easy for us to comprehend wherein lies the precise suitability. As everywhere, throughout this study, we cannot hope to do more than reach a statement of the difficulties and the problems, though often a clear statement of the question involves a suggestion of a reply (and in so far as it does this it involves personal opinion and hypothesis, and is liable to fall into subjectivity and error).

We observed the peculiar suitability of the Ephesian address to the situation of Ephesus as the centre and practical leader of the whole group of Asian Churches. Hence the final detail in that address—"He that walketh in the midst of the seven golden lampstands"; for (as we already saw) the lampstands symbolize the Churches on earth, as the seven Stars symbolize the seven Churches, or their spiritual counterparts, in heaven. Instead of this the Sardian address introduces "the seven Spirits of God." A more explicit and definite expression of the activity of the Divine nature in the Churches on earth evidently recommended itself as suitable in addressing the Sardian Church.

One naturally asks here, what is the reason? wherein lies the suitability? To answer the question, it is obviously necessary to look at the prominent point of difference between Sardis and Ephesus (which we have already stated). Ephesus had changed and cooled, but the degeneration had not yet become serious; restoration of its old character and enthusiasm was still possible. As a Church Ephesus might possibly be in the future as great as it had been in the past. But the Church of Sardis was already dead, though it seemed to be living. It was done

with the past. A revivification of its former self was impossible. There remained only a few in it for whom there was some hope. They might survive, as they had hitherto shown themselves worthy. And they shall survive, for the power which has hitherto sustained them will be with them and keep them to the end. In this scanty remnant of the formerly great Church of Sardis, the Divine power will show itself all the more conspicuous. Just as in the comparatively humble city of Thyatira the faithful few shall be granted a strength and authority beyond that of the Empire and its armies, so in this small remnant at Sardis the Divine power will be most effective, because they stand most in need of it.

It is not to be imagined that this consideration exhausts the case. There remains much more that is at present beyond our ken. The more we can learn about Sardis, the better we understand the letter.

In none of the Seven Letters is the method of the writer, and the reason that guided him in selecting the topics more clearly displayed than in the letter to the Church in Sardis. The advice which he gives to the Sardians is, in a way, universally suitable to human nature: "Be watchful; be more careful; carry out more completely and thoroughly what you have still to do, for hitherto you have always erred in leaving work half done and incomplete. Try to make that first enthusiasm and eager attention with which you seemed to listen to the Gospel a permanent feature in your conduct. If you are not watchful, you will not be ready at the moment of need: my arrival will find you unprepared, because 'in an hour that ye think not the Son of Man cometh'; any one can make ready for a fixed hour, but you must be always ready for an unexpected hour."

Advice like that is, in a sense, universal. All persons, every individual man and every body of men, constantly

require the advice to be watchful, and to carry through to completion what they once enter upon, for all men tend more or less to slacken in their exertions and to leave half-finished ends of work. In all men there is observable a discrepancy between promise and performance; the first show is almost always superior to the final result.

But why are these precise topics selected for the Sardian letter, and not for any of the others? Why does the reference to the thief in the night suggest itself in this letter and not in any other? It is plain that Ephesus was suffering from the same tendency to growing slackness as Sardis, and that its first enthusiasm had cooled down almost as lamentably as was the case in the Sardian Church. Yet the advice to Ephesus, though like in many respects, is expressed in very different words.

But in almost every letter similar questions suggest themselves. There were faithful Christians in every one of the Churches; but the word "faithful" is used only of Smyrna. Every Church was brought into the same conflict with the Roman State; but only in the Pergamenian letter is the opposition between the Church and the Empire expressly emphasized, and only in the Thyatiran letter is the superiority in strength and might of the Church over the State mentioned.

In the Sardian letter the reason is unusually clear; and to this point our attention must now be especially directed.

No city in the whole Province of Asia had a more splendid history in past ages than Sardis. No city of Asia at that time showed such a melancholy contrast between past splendour and present decay as Sardis. Its history was the exact opposite of the record of Smyrna. Smyrna was dead and (yet) lived. Sardis lived, and was dead.

Sardis was the great city of ancient times and of half-historical legend. At the beginning of the Greek memory of history in Lydia, Sardis stood out conspicuous and alone

as the capital of the great Oriental Empire with which the Greek cities and colonies were brought in contact. Their relations with Lydia formed the one great question of foreign politics for those early Greek settlers; and Lydia was Sardis. Everything else was secondary, or was under their own control, but in regard to Sardis they had always to be thinking of foreign wishes, foreign rights, the caprice of a foreign monarch and the convenience of foreign traders, who were too powerful to be disregarded or treated with disrespect. Thus Sardis before the middle of the sixth century B.C. was to the Greek colonies of the Ægean coasts the great city of the East; to them it represented Asia as distinguished from, and always more or less hostile to, Europe and Greece. That impression the Asiatic Greeks, with their tenacious historical memory, never entirely lost. Sardis was always to them the capital where Croesus, richest of kings, had ruled—the city which Solon, wisest of men, had visited, and where he had rightly augured ruin because he had rightly mistrusted material wealth and luxury as necessarily hollow and treacherous—the fortress of many warlike kings, like Gyges, whose power was so great that legend credited him with the possession of the gold ring of supernatural power, or Alyattes, whose vast tomb rose like a mountain above the Hermus valley beside the sacred lake of the Mother Goddess.

But to those Greeks of the coast colonies, Ephesus and Smyrna and the rest, Sardis was also the city of failure, the city whose history was marked by the ruin of great kings and the downfall of great military strength, apparently in mid-career, when it seemed to be at its highest development. It was the city whose history conspicuously and pre-eminently blazoned forth the uncertainty of human fortunes, the weakness of human strength, and the shortness of the step that separates over-confident might from sudden and irreparable disaster. It was the city whose

name was almost synonymous with pretensions unjustified, promise unfulfilled, appearance without reality, confidence that heralded ruin. Reputed an impregnable fortress, it had repeatedly fallen short of its reputation, and ruined those who trusted in it. Croesus, after losing a battle with his first army against Cyrus far in the east beyond the Halys, retired to Sardis at the beginning of winter, and issued orders for the concentration of all his forces in the ensuing spring to continue the war; he fancied he could sit safe in the great fortress, but his enemy advanced straight upon it and carried it by assault before the strength of the Lydian land was collected.

Carelessness, and failure to keep proper watch, arising from over-confidence in the apparent strength of the fortress, had been the cause of this disaster, which ruined the dynasty and brought to an end the Lydian Empire and the dominance of Sardis. The walls and gates were all as strong as art and nature combined could make them. The hill was steep and lofty on which the upper city stood. The one approach to the upper city was too carefully fortified to offer any chance to an assailant. But there was one weak point: in one place it was possible for an active enemy to make his way up the perpendicular sides of the lofty hill, if the defenders stood idle and permitted him to climb unhindered. According to the legend this weak point existed from the beginning of history in Sardis, because, when the divine consecration and encompassing of the new fortress had been made at its foundation, this point had been omitted; thus the tale would imply that the weak point was known to the defenders and through mere obstinate folly left unguarded by them. But such a legend is usually a growth after the fact. The crumbling character of the rock on which the upper city of Sardis stood shows what the real facts must have been. In the course of time a weakness had developed at one point. Through want of

proper care in surveying and repairing the fortifications this weakness had remained unobserved and unknown to the defenders ; but the assailants, scrutinizing every inch of the walls of the great fortress in search of an opportunity, noticed it and availed themselves of it to climb up, one at a time. On such a lofty hill, rising fully 1,500 feet above the plain, whose sides are and must from their nature always have been steep and straight and practically perpendicular, a child could guard against an army ; even a small stone dropped on the head of the most skilful mountain-climber, would inevitably hurl him down. An attack made by this path could succeed only if the assailants climbed up entirely unobserved ; and they could not escape observation unless they made the attempt by night. Hence, even though this be unrecorded, a night attack must have been the way by which Cyrus entered Sardis. He came upon the great city " like a thief in the night."

The sudden ruin of that great Empire and the wealthiest king of all the world was an event of that character which most impressed the Greek mind, emphasizing a moral lesson by a great national disaster. A little carelessness was shown ; a watchman was wanting at the necessary point, or a sentinel slept at his post for an hour ; and the greatest power on the earth was hurled to destruction. The great king trusted to Sardis, and Sardis failed him at the critical moment. Promise was unfulfilled ; the appearance of strength proved the mask of weakness ; the fortification was incomplete ; work which had been begun with great energy was not pushed through to its conclusion with the same determination.

More than three centuries later another case of exactly the same kind occurred. Achæus and Antiochus the Great were fighting for the command of Lydia and the whole Seleucid Empire. Antiochus besieged his rival in Sardis, and the city again was captured by a surprise of the

same nature ; a Cretan mercenary led the way, climbing up the hill and stealing unobserved within the fortifications. The lesson of old days had not been learned ; experience had been forgotten ; men were too slack and careless ; and when the moment of need came, Sardis was unprepared.

A State cannot survive which is guarded with such carelessness ; a people so slack and ineffective cannot continue an imperial power. Sardis, as a great and ruling city, was dead. It had sunk to be a second-rate or third-rate city of a Province. Yet it still retained the name and the historical memory of a capital city. It had great pretensions, which it had vainly tried to establish in A.D. 26 before the tribunal of the Roman Senate in the contention among the Asian cities recorded by Tacitus, *Annals*, iv. 55.

No one can doubt that this Sardian letter took its form in part through the memory of that ancient history. It was impossible for the Sardians to miss the allusion, and therefore the writer must have intended it and calculated on it. Phrase after phrase is chosen for the evident purpose of recalling that ancient memory, which was undoubtedly still strong and living among the Sardians, for the Hellenic cities had a retentive historical recollection, and we know that Sardis in the great pleading in A.D. 26 rested its case on a careful selection of facts from its past history "I know thy works, that thou hast a name that thou livest, and thou art dead. Be thou watchful, and stablish the things that remain, which were ready to die : for I have found no works of thine fulfilled before my God. . . . If therefore thou shalt not watch, I will come as a thief, and thou shalt not know what hour I will come upon thee."

It seems therefore undeniable that the writer has selected topics which rise out of and stand in close relation to the past history of Sardis as a city. In view of this evident plan and guiding purpose, are we to understand that he

preferred the older historical reference, and left aside the actual fortunes of the Church as secondary, when he was sketching out the order of his letter? Such a supposition is impossible. The writer is in those words drawing a picture of the history and degeneration of the Sardian Church; but he draws it in such a way as to set before his readers the continuity of Sardian history. The story of the Church is a repetition of past experience; the character of the people remains unchanged; their faults are still the same, and their fate must be the same.

If this view be correct—and it seems forced on us unavoidably by the facts of the case—then another inference must inevitably follow: the writer, so far from separating the Church of Sardis from the city of Sardis, emphasizes strongly the closeness of the connexion between them. The Church of Sardis is not merely in the city of Sardis, it is in a sense the city; and the Christians are the people of the city. There is not in his mind the slightest idea that Christians are to keep out of the world—as might perhaps be suggested from a too exclusive contemplation of some parts of the Revelation; the Church here is addressed almost as if to suggest that the fortunes of ancient Sardis had been its own fortunes, that it had endured those sieges, committed those faults of carelessness and blind confidence, and sunk into the same decay and death as the city.

That this is intentional and deliberate cannot be questioned for a moment. What this writer said he meant. There is no accident or unintended significance in those carefully chosen and well weighed words. In regard to this letter the same reflections arise as were already suggested in the case of the other letters, and especially the Smyrnaean and Pergamenian. In his conflict with the Nicolaitans the writer was never betrayed into mere blind opposition to them; he never rejected their views from mere hatred of those who held them; he took the wider

view which embraced everything that was right and true in the principles of the Nicolaitans—and there was a good deal that was rightly thought and well said by them—together with a whole world of thought which they had no eyes to see. In the Seven Letters he repeatedly gives marked emphasis to the principle, which the Nicolaitans rightly maintained, that the Christians should be a force in the world, moulding it gradually to a Christian model.

Throughout the Letters the writer seems constantly to be reiterating one thought, “See how much better the true eternal Church does everything than any of the false pretenders and opponents can do them.” In regard to one detail after another he points out how far superior is the Christian form to that in which it is tendered by the Imperial State, by the cities, or by false teachers. If Laodiceia clothes its citizens with the glossy black woollen garments of its famous industry, he offers white garments to clothe the true Laodiceans. If the State has its mighty military strength and its imperial authority, he points out to the true remnant among the Thyatirans that a more crushing and irresistible might shall be placed in their hands, and offers to the Pergamenian victors a wider authority over worlds seen and unseen. If the Nicolaitans emphasize the intimate relation between the life of the Church and the organization of the State and the society amid which the Church exists, he states with equal emphasis, but with the proper additions, that the Church is so closely connected with the State and the City that it can be regarded as sharing in a way their life, fortunes and powers.

It is not fanciful to trace here, as in other cases, a connexion between the spirit of the advice tendered and the permanent features of nature amid which the city stood and by which it was insensibly moulded. Sardis stood, or rather the upper and the only fortified city stood, on a lofty hill, a spur projecting north from Mount Tmolus and dominating

the Hermus valley. The hill has still, in its dilapidated and diminished extent, an imposing appearance; but it undoubtedly presented a far more splendid show two or three thousand years ago, when the top must have been a broad plateau of considerable extent, the sides of which were almost perpendicular walls of rock, except where a narrow isthmus connected the hill with the mountains behind it on the south. Towards the plain, north, east and west, it presented the most imposing show, a city with walls and towers, temples, houses and palaces, filling the elevated plateau so completely that on all sides it looked as if one could drop a stone 1,500 feet straight into the plain from the outer buildings.

The rock, however, on which Sardis was built was only nominally a rock. In reality, as you go nearer it, you see that it is only mud slightly compacted, and easily dissolved by rain. It is, however, so constituted that it wears away with an almost perpendicular face; but rain and frost continually diminish it, so that now little remains of the upper plateau on which the city stood, and in one place the plateau has been worn almost wholly through, so that the visitor needs a fairly cool head and steady nerve to walk from one part of it to the other. The isthmus connecting the plateau with Tmolus on the south has been worn away in the same fashion.

There can be no doubt that the isthmus, as being the solitary approach, must always have been the most strongly fortified part. At present the plateau is said not to be accessible at any other point except where the isthmus touches it; but there are several chinks and clefts leading up the north and west faces,¹ and I should expect that by one of them a bold and practised climber could make his way up. These clefts vary in character from century to century as the surface disintegrates; and all of them would

¹ I have not seen the east face from a near point.

always be regarded by the ordinary peaceful and unathletic oriental citizen as inaccessible. But from time to time sometimes one, sometimes another, would offer a chance to a daring mountaineer. By such an approach it must have been that Cyrus in 549, and Antiochus in 218, captured the city. It is right to add that the account that we have given of the way in which Sardis was captured differs from the current opinion in one point. The usual view is that Cyrus entered Sardis by the isthmus or neck on the south. That was the natural and necessary path in ordinary use; the only road and gateway were there; and inevitably the defence of the city was based on a careful guard and strong fortification at the solitary approach. The enemy was expected to attack there; but the point of the tale is that the ascent was made on a side where no guard was ever stationed, because that side was believed to be inaccessible. The misapprehension is as old as the time of Herodotus (or rather some of old Greek glossator, who has interposed a false explanation in the otherwise clear narrative of Herodotus I. 84).

The crumbling, poor character of the rock must always have been a feature that impressed the thinking mind, and led it to associate the character of the inhabitants with this feature of the situation. Instability, untrustworthiness, inefficiency, deterioration—such is the impression that the rock gives, and such was the character of Sardian history and of the Sardian Church—as we have just seen.

This series of studies of the Seven Letters may be exposed, perhaps, to the charge of imagining fanciful connexions between the natural surroundings of the Seven Cities and the tone of the Seven Letters. Those who are accustomed to the variety of character that exists in the West will refuse to acknowledge that there exists any such connexion between the character of the natural surroundings and the spirit, the Angel, of the Church.

But Western analogy is misleading. We are accustomed to struggle against Nature, and by understanding Nature's laws to subjugate her to our needs. When a waterway is needed, as at Glasgow, we transform a little stream into a navigable river. Where a harbour is necessary to supply a defect in nature, we construct with vast toil and at great cost an artificial harbour. We regulate the flow of dangerous rivers, utilizing all that they can give us and restraining them from inflicting the harm they are capable of. Thus in numberless ways we refuse to yield to the influences that surround us, and by hard work rise superior in some degree to them.

Such analogy must not be applied without careful consideration in Asia. There man is far more under the influence of nature; and hence results a homogeneity of character in each place which is surprising to the Western traveller, and which he can hardly believe or realize without long experience. Partly it may be because nature and the powers of nature are on a vaster scale in Asia. You can climb the highest Alps, but the Himalayas present untrodden peaks, where the powers of man fail. The Eastern people have had little chance of subduing and binding to their will the mighty rivers of Asia (except the Chinese, who regulated their greatest rivers more than 2,000 years ago). The Hindus have come to recognize the jungle as unconquerable, and its wild beasts as irresistible; and they passively acquiesce in their fate. Vast Asiatic deserts are accepted as due to the will of God; and through this humble resignation other great stretches of land which once were highly cultivated have come to be marked on the maps as desert, because the difficulties of cultivation are no longer surmountable by a passive and uninventive population. In Asia mankind has accepted nature; and the attempts to struggle against it have been almost wholly confined to a remote past or to European settlers.

How it was that Asiatic races could do more to influence nature in a very early time than they have ever attempted in later times is a problem that deserves separate consideration. Here we only observe that they themselves attributed their early activity entirely to religion; the Mother-Goddess herself taught her children how to conquer nature by obeying her and using her powers.

But among the experiences which specially impress the traveller who patiently explores Asia Minor step by step, village by village, and province by province, perhaps the most impressive of all is the extent to which natural circumstances mould the fate of cities and the character of men. The dominance of nature over the minds of those Asiatic peoples is, certainly, more complete now than it was of old; but still even in the early ages of history it was great, and it was a main factor both in moulding the historical mythology, or mythical explanations of historical facts, that were current among the common people, and in guiding the more reasoned and pretentious scientific explanations of history set forth by the educated and the philosophers. Among the latter may be classed, in a certain degree, and on one side only of their contents, the Seven Letters; for they contain among other things an outline of "the philosophy of history" for the Seven Cities, and in almost every case the history of the city is viewed in relation to the eternal features of nature around it.

W. M. RAMSAY.

LOISY UPON THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT.

THE Sermon on the Mount raises two problems. Or, rather, the problems which it starts fall into one or other of two classes. The first set of questions relates to its origin, and may be described as "critical." The existence of two versions in Matthew and Luke denotes the presence of a literary problem which demands an exercise of documentary analysis and an application of certain general principles involved in the wider synoptic question, in order to determine the precise relation of these two versions to each other, with their respective value and their comparative amount of redaction, as well as to reconstruct an outline of the original sermon, as that may have lain in some earlier document behind both Matthew and Luke. The other class of problems relates to the ethical value and meaning of the discourse. Here the question is one of "applied" Christianity,¹ and the task of the expositor is to determine the exact bearing of the Sermon upon such matters as marriage, oaths, and retaliation,² or to ascertain the authoritative and unique elements in the mind of Jesus.

Both problems have their own difficulties, and yet the very statement of the second shows that it really runs back to the first. This does not mean merely that, before taking Christ at His word, one must do one's best to find out what His word is. The point is that the history of these words, the history of them in action as well as of their interpretation, forms a useful clue to many problems which beset the

¹ See the article by L. Goumaz on "Le Sermon sur la Montagne: constitue-t-il tout l'évangile," in *Revue de Théol. et Phil.* (1903), pp. 105-135.

² "Strictly observed, the golden rule involves the negation of law by the refusal to put it in motion against law breakers; . . . it can be obeyed, even partially, only under the protection of a society which repudiates it" (Huxley's *Evolution and Ethics*, p. 32). All hangs on the phrase, "Strictly observed."

student who essays to find out what they meant and mean. In other words, although to render Christ's Sermon on the Mount merely antiquarian is as bad as to modernize it, the discussion between the two classes of questions upon the Sermon, to which I have alluded, is generally a ruinous procedure. Rays of light are thrown upon the real meaning of the discourse, and upon the sense in which it is to be taken as a permanent standard of Christianity, if it is first of all set in the early Christian tradition. I do not suggest, of course, that the interpretation or interpretations of the Church in and after the second century (or, for the matter of that, within the first century) are to be accepted as normative, for some circles of the early Church soon came either to misconstrue or to evade, as really as ¹ modern Christianity, several cardinal principles in the ethical teaching of Jesus. The general consideration which I would urge, is this: Supposing we find the early Church apparently oblivious to some difficulty which presses on a modern mind in the interpretation of the Sermon, is it not fair to ask whether the difficulty may not be due after all to a wrong standpoint? ² May not some part of our problem be gratuitous? or, if we choose to call it so, subjective? This applies especially to the question of the literal fulfilment of counsels such as those upon retaliation, for some of the confusion here may easily be the result of reading Oriental and unqualified statements in a prosaic, Western fashion, so that the vitality and spirit of the counsel is lost or blurred in a vain, if creditable, endeavour to preserve the letter. Thus it is more than interesting to

¹ Perhaps even more so; see von Dobschütz's *die urchristlichen Gemeinden* (1902), pp. 252 f.

² Thus the Sermon seems to have been originally designed as a catechism for the mutual intercourse of Christians within their own societies. A change of standpoint was inevitable when the problem widened, under the exigencies of history, to embrace the relation of Christians, either individually or as a Church, to outside society.

trace the Sermon in the apostolic and post-apostolic literature. To watch it at work in that early age, to see how it struck and moulded people in almost the same *milieu* as that of Jesus, is to gain some real insight into its direct heroic message of unselfishness, simplicity, and inwardness, as practical and urgent bases for existence. No doubt, before the last quarter of the first century, it is impossible to suppose that the Sermon was circulated in the fuller Matthean form in which it makes its impact on the modern mind. But the substance of its logia, and certainly the more characteristic of the logia themselves, must have been current in the catechetical instruction of the Churches, and even in Paul we can feel the vibration of an evangelic tradition homogeneous with that of our canonical Sermon.¹ Both in Paulinism and in the later Christian literature, where a literary acquaintance with the Gospels becomes visible, any traces of the Sermon show its authority within the Churches, and also the elastic, sensible, and loyal fashion in which its precepts were applied or its principles followed out.

Thus "no retaliation" is from the very outset a cardinal principle of early Christian ethics (1 Thess. v. 15), as is plain from Paul's own conduct (1 Cor. iv. 12, cf. Didaché i.); yet he judges sharply when occasion demands (1 Cor. iv. 19, 21), and evidently has no idea of allowing gentleness to degenerate into amiable inefficiency in managing his own or other people's affairs. He interprets broadly (that is, if he knew it) the logion prohibiting litigation (Matt. v. 39, 40 = Luke vi. 29f., cf. 1 Cor. vi. 1, etc.), suggesting the appointment of a Christian as arbiter, if the Christian rule proved too high and hard. He also checks the tendency to take advantage of people's unlimited good-nature (Matt. v.

¹ See Titius, *der Paulinismus unter dem Gesichtspunkt der Seligkeit* (1900), pp. 8-18. For a parallel to the beatitudes from an extra-canonical gospel underlying the *κηρύγματα Πέτρον* see Hans Waitz in the *Zeits. für die neutest. Wiss.* (1903), pp. 335-340.

39f.); no *extortioner* is to inherit God's realm. The spirit of Romans xiv. 17 is akin to that of Matthew's beatitudes, and "love, the fulfilment of the law," reappears in Romans xiii. 8-10, etc. Other instances might readily be multiplied.¹ But these will suffice to bring out the general principle, that, while the ethical ideal of the Sermon shines paramount in all the reminiscences which can be traced throughout Paul (and the same applies to the later writers, in more or less fulness), there is no thought of making the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus a rigid formula of conduct, nor is there any attempt to conserve the letter at the expense of the spirit. As Harnack points out, those who tried to restrict the moral code of Christianity to the sayings of the Sermon on the Mount "and turned aside from the Jewish-Greek inheritance, landed in Marcionite or Eucratite doctrines" (*Hist. of Dogma*, i. 154). And this was not because the Sermon was inadequate, but because its real function was to yield a fund of motive, principle, and stimulus.

The bearing of this has seldom been recognized by expositors of the Sermon, and even in its most recent² and distinguished interpreter there is little or no sign that he is conscious of the vital function of early Christian tradition in the exegesis of the discourse. Loisy's lucid, frank, and ingenious monograph³ deals now and then with the ethical application of the Sermon as well as with the critical

¹ Thus, as Bugge puts it, *Zeitschrift für die neuest. Wissens.*, 1903, p. 106), the epistle to the Hebrews is really a commentary on Matt. v. 18. On oaths, see Holtzmann's *Hand-Commentar*, I. i. (1901), pp. 211f., 279f.

² I have not been able to see the essay on "die Bergpredigt" (Frankfurt, 1901) by a Nicht-Theologen, J. Vitalis, or the French work by Lacroix on "Le discours de Jésus sur la Montagne. Trad. avec commentaire" (Chambéry, 1904). What is badly wanted is a monograph on the Sermon similar to Dr. Chase's well-known essay on the Lord's Prayer in the Early Church.

³ *Le Discours sur la Montagne* (1903), a reprint of four articles contributed by the Abbé to the *Revue de l'histoire et de littérature religieuses*, during 1903.

problem of its origin. But his interests in the former line are mainly absorbed by the old antithesis of Protestant and Roman Catholic interpretations. Thus he frankly admits (pp. 58f.) that the Greek interpretation of Matthew v. 22 is true to the meaning of the passage, but at the same time it has also "toute chance de n'être pas celui de Jésus." To introduce such an exception to the law as the justification of divorce for adultery would imply, is to supplant the Gospel by the Law, and consequently Loisy agrees with those who see in *παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας* an editorial gloss, due to the spirit of practical accommodation in the Jewish-Christian Church which quailed before the absolute ideal of the Master. He thus bravely defends the Council of Trent by a hold critical attitude to the text of Matthew. The Council was true to the real principle laid down by Jesus, but this principle, he avers, cannot be truly grasped except by those who are prepared to follow historical criticism and separate the original sayings of our Lord from their evangelic accretions. This is thoroughly characteristic of Loisy. Dr. Johnson once told with evident approval of how Arnauld struck out something which Boileau had written in a moment of theological daring, with the prudential remark: "Vous gagnerez deux ou trois impies, et perdrez je ne sais combien des honnêtes gens." There is a fine ring of the time-server in a caution of this kind, but fortunately the Abbé Loisy is of another mind, and his French fearlessness is all to the good in handling New Testament criticism.

The symbolic methods, e.g., which he has applied recently with equal thoroughness to the Fourth Gospel is employed here as frankly (but less happily I think) to explain Matthew v. 1. No one doubts that in the mind of the man who composed our Gospel of Matthew there was an implicit idea of suggesting that Jesus promulgated in the Sermon the new law of the new kingdom, like a second Moses.

But this does not necessarily imply that the "mountain" is purely ideal and symbolic in Matthew (pp. 8, 9), even in view of xxviii. 16. As Strauss pointed out long ago (§ 76), the very discrepancy between Luke's *level spot* and Matthew's *mountain*, proves that both evangelists were aware of a technical connexion (which is at least corroborated by topography) between this sermon and a mountain. Only, while Matthew considered that a mountain formed a suitable elevation for getting a crowd within earshot, Luke thought that Jesus must have descended in order to address His audience.¹ It is one thing to hold that the author of Matthew read into the mountain-setting of the sermon a meaning which invested it with the character of a *mise en scène* analogous to that of the Sinaitic delivery of the law. It is quite another thing, for which there seems neither necessity nor justification, to conjecture that the mountain-setting was a novel and imaginative touch which we owe to the final editor of Matthew. An equally precarious application of the allegorical method is the suggestion (p. 35) that in the saying upon light, Luke substitutes *those who enter* for Matthew's *those who are within the house*, "parce que, dans l'interprétation allégorique, la lumière chrétienne est destinée à éclairer les gens du dehors?" This is much too subtle. Before people are in a house they must enter it.

The original sermon in Loisy's reconstruction consisted of the beatitudes, in a form which must have approximated to that of Luke vi. 20-23; the bulk of Matthew v. 17-24,²

¹ In the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (4389) I argued that the sermon was originally addressed to "disciples," and I am glad to have Loisy's independent, if partial, support on this point (pp. 10-12), although he does not define "disciples" in the exact sense which such a hypothesis seems to necessitate.

² Matthew v. 23, 24, he suggests, would lie better in the vicinity of vi. 14, 15 (so Heinrici). He seems to admit its authenticity, though allowing that it might have been a Jewish-Christian saying, designed as an evangelic interpretation of Hosea's well-known oracle (Matt. ix. 13, xii.

27-28, 31-48 (Luke vi. 27-36); Matthew vii. 1-5 (Luke vi. 37, 41, 42); Matthew vii. 12 (Luke vi. 31); Matthew vii. 17-20 (Luke vi. 43-45); Matthew vii. 21-23 (Luke vi. 46, xiii. 26, 27); and Matthew vii. 24-27 (Luke vi. 47-49). Even in this form, or in any similar reconstruction, the sermon is obviously more or less of a compilation, and this lack of entire homogeneity is increased by the editorial processes to which it has been subjected in Matthew and Luke. "The transpositions and other modifications which the evangelists permitted themselves, show plainly that they took up a didactic standpoint, and that they were specially concerned for the meaning of the various counsels as well as for the use which could be made of them in edifying their readers, quite apart from any regard to the special circumstances in which each sentence might have been uttered. They were either indifferent to such circumstances, or else ignorant of them" (p. 5). Loisy does ample justice to this influence exerted by the later period of the evangelists, and in particular by the Jewish-Christian *milieu* of Matthew's tradition, upon the form and contents of the sermon (e.g. in Matt. v. 11, 12, Luke vi. 24-26,¹ Matt. vii. 15f, and Matt. vii. 22f²), in which the rays of Christ's Galilean thought and work reach us through the atmosphere of neo-legalism and practical apostolic interests. In the closing parable (Matt. vii. 24-27), certain details

7). Verses 25, 26 are of course regarded as an intrusion. Literally, they would be "Mieux dans la bouche d'un paysan rusé"; while the allegorical sense given them by Matthew does not even agree exactly with the context. Perhaps, too, verse 36 is a redactional gloss, or else 36, 37, represent the original nucleus round which the previous words gathered (p. 65).

¹ On the maledictions, see pp. 26, 27 ("en tous cas, il est invraisemblable, que ces malédictions aient existé dans la source où ont été consignées d'abord les béatitudes; elles ont du être ajoutées par Luc à la tradition documentaire dont il dépend").

² "Cette gloss a pris la place d'une texte authentique dont la teneur est conservée par Luc en un autre endroit [xiii. 26 f.];" cf. pp. 138, 139, and Pfeiderer's *Urchrist.* ² (1902), i. 444, 568.

of which are more primitive in Luke than in Matthew, Loisy argues that the resemblance to R. Elisa's well-known parable show that "si l'on n'admet pas l'existence d'un thème commun, exploité d'abord par Jésus, la dépendance des Évangiles à l'égard de la parabole rabbinique sera beaucoup moins vraisemblable que l'hypothèse contraire" (p. 142).

In his treatment of the beatitudes Loisy is much more restrained than e.g. J. Weiss. The latter restores their original form in Q (the pre-canonical source) as follows:—

Blessed are the poor, for theirs is the kingdom of God.

Blessed are the mourners, for they shall be comforted.

Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth.

Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled.

Blessed are they that are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

Loisy also adheres to the canonical order of the second and third beatitudes, and he admits that Matthew's version is a didactic paraphrase with some Old Testament colouring, although it is truer to the spirit of Jesus than Luke's version, in which the original has been materialized (pp. 16, 19). But he does not think that any importance attaches to the number of the beatitudes in Matthew (which seems rash in view of Matthew's numerical pragmatism), or that it is possible to detect Matthew's additions or Luke's omissions. This is cautious, almost gratuitously cautious. But it is nearer the mark at any rate than the subsequent attempt (pp. 32 f.) to transfer the ideas of Matthew v. 13–14 from Jesus to the catholicism and universal outlook of a later evangelist, an attempt which, like most of its fellows, is propped up on a purely *à priori* conception of the limitations attaching to Christ's outlook.

The long section upon the gospel and the Jewish law (Matt. v. 17–48) opens with three verses which have long been a crux of criticism (see Mackintosh's *Christ and the*

Jewish Law, pp. 25 f.), the main difficulty being to reconcile the apparent conservatism of 18-19 with the freer spirit of v. 20. K. Manhot has recently (*Protest. Monatshefte*, 1902, 211-27) proposed to read ἕως ἀν πάντα γένηται with ver. 17, ver. 18 otherwise being a genuine saying which followed ver. 19 originally, both lying between vii. 12 and vii. 13. This undoubtedly gives a fairly smooth connexion, besides furnishing an interesting basis for a defence of the authenticity of the entire passage, vv. 17-20. Simultaneously Wiesen (in the *Zeitschrift für die neutest. Wissens.*, 1902, pp. 336-52) proposed to interpret ver. 18 in the light of its original (Lucan) context,¹ but he fails to give an unforced interpretation of the verse as it stands in Matthew, and he is obliged to take ver. 19 as a statement of inclusion and exclusion, not of various degrees within the kingdom itself, the scribes and Pharisees of ver. 20 being the individuals alluded to in 19a. Loisy approximates more nearly to Pfeiderer (i. pp. 563 f.), who takes 17-19 as an unauthentic insertion, although the substance of 17-18 may well be a genuine idea of Jesus. As the French critic observes, the keynote of the passage is *πληρῶσαι* in ver. 17. On the lips of Jesus (pp. 40 f.) this denoted the idea that by His teaching and attitude towards the law, Jesus "re-discovered the Divine meaning of the law and the higher meaning of Providence which it contained." But in vv. 18-19 the redactor, pre-occupied with the notion of the prophecies and their fulfilment in the gospel,² supplements and safeguards this idea with another, viz. that none the less there would be a typological or mys-

¹ E. Rodenbusch (in the same journal, 1903, pp. 244 f.), taking Matthew v. 18-19 as an unauthentic Jewish-Christian interpolation, ejects Luke xvi. 17 also from its present context as an interruption of the passage in its original current.

² "Il attribue au mot *accomplir* un sens qui permet de faire intervenir l'écriture entière non seulement comme règle divine de la conduite, mais comme recueil de prédictions formelles ou typiques dont l'Évangile apporte la réalisation" (p. 39).

tical fulfilment of the law. The phrase *ἕως ἄν πάντα γένηται* refers to "ces choses-là qui ne passeront pas sans accomplissement"—an adventitious gloss of the redactor. Apart from this, Loisy is thoroughly right in adding that ver. 18 is to be read in the light of ver. 19, the idea being "not the evangelic sense of a perfect realization for those Divine commands which are expressed in the law, but the observation of the law in the Jewish sense of the term." To ease the contrast between the principle of ver. 19 and that underlying sayings like Matthew xx. 23 and xxii. 40, the editor further appended ver. 20, which serves as a transition from 17 f. to the details of 21 f. The whole passage is regarded by Loisy as in the main foreign to the general spirit and teaching of Jesus, and he falls back on the hypothesis of its origin within some early Jewish-Christian circle, which wove its anti-Pauline prejudice into the synoptic tradition. Finding the passage in their common source, both Matthew and Luke felt themselves unable to omit it; but they dealt comparatively freely with it as in some respects a puzzling logion, Luke re-setting it, while Matthew edited it for his own purposes of edification. The question of the law, says Loisy very frankly, never presented itself to Jesus in the terms of our text. But when the controversy over the law arose in primitive Christianity, the Judaizing or conservative party could appeal to the negative fact that Jesus had never announced the abrogation of the law. This they converted, in all good faith, into the positive assertion that He must have maintained its eternal validity.¹ The remarkable thing is that the first recension of the sermon is not infected with the spirit of this circle of Jewish Christians, perhaps, among other reasons, because no gloss could be added to the text during the lifetime of the original disciples (p. 46). Loisy

¹ On this see Bousset's *Die Religion des Judentums*, pp. 87-89, where the Philonic background of Matthew v. 18-19 is brought out.

thus agrees with Wernle in regarding *ἕως ἄν πάντα γένηται* (omitted by Luke) as an editorial gloss (like the "iota" in ver. 18 also), though he goes beyond the German critic in seeing an anti-Pauline reference in the context. Naturally he sees Jesus (in the subsequent series of utterances) giving a complete form to the law itself, and not correcting any false Pharisaic interpretation of its precepts.¹

Two points at least in this line of argument seem fairly sound. One is the refusal to attempt any solution of the problem by introducing the hypothesis that in the consciousness of Jesus a traditional view of the law was struggling, even ineffectively, with a purely religious view (see Wiesen, pp. 338 f., for a refutation of this idea). The other is the recourse, however tentatively, to the hypothesis of different recensions and editorial manipulation of the original text. Apart from some application of the latter theory, it seems almost hopeless to gain any coherent idea of what was the mind of Jesus upon the Jewish law in relation to His gospel, or any satisfactory exegesis of the passage under discussion. Where I do not feel so sure of Loisy's exposition is the explanation which he gives of the psychological standpoint assumed by Matthew.

Maldonatus the Jesuit, in warning his readers that the sayings and deeds of Jesus are not always reported in chronological order throughout the Gospels, refers to the Sermon on the Mount as a case in point. "Credibile est haec verba (Matt. vii. 1) in concione quam Matthaeus c. v.

¹ Manchot, again, declares that the vital antithesis of Christ's preaching might be summed up thus: "The law and the prophets" versus "the law = the Pentateuch + the Pharisees." He rightly thinks that "the law and the prophets" are an expression deliberately chosen by Jesus to denote the direct revelation of God (cf. Jer. vii. 22), in contrast to "the law," which had been associated with angelic media, etc. Consequently *πληρῶσαι* (cf. 1 Kings i. 14) on the lips of Jesus had not the connotation which it afterwards acquired in Paulinism, but meant the effect produced upon the law and its recognition by Christ's free, deeper treatment of its precepts, which He at once supplemented and enlarged in part. Cp. Meyer's *Jesu Muttersprache*, pp. 79 f.

recitavit, dicta fuisse, esseque cum ver. 48 c. v. jungenda . . . et quia hoc modo sententia sententiae, verba verbis bene cohaerent, et quia Lucas ita conjungit." This remark, which anticipates some of the axioms of modern criticism upon the Sermon, is endorsed by Loisy (pp. 76 f., 113 f.), who naturally regards ch. vi. as a long interpolation, which may have existed independently as a small evangelic catechism or cycle of sayings drawn up to elucidate the new Christian praxis. Neither here nor elsewhere, however, does he do justice to the eschatological element¹ in βασιλεία and δικαιοσύνη, to which J. Wein (*die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes*,² 1900, pp. 145 f.) and Wernle have rightly called attention. Like Achelis, he takes the Sermon in Matthew to be a discourse on Christian "righteousness," but this "righteousness" is merely and vaguely defined as "la perfection de vie par laquelle on plaît à Dieu."

But if Matthew vii. 1-5 represent a natural pendant to the ideas of v. 48, the sayings in vii. 6 f. are plainly erratic boulders. The difficult apostolic saying in vii. 6 is singularly isolated, for the connexions of thought which are sometimes constructed for it with what precedes and follows are generally artificial. Even its meaning is obscure. Loisy, who rejects the ordinary interpretations, inclines to fall

¹ He derives ἐπιούσιος from ἐπεῖναι—"notre pain suffisant," "le pain de suffisance," "la nourriture indispensable." "Tous les jours nous avons besoin de pain pour notre corps et de pardon pour notre âme." He objects to the usual renderings of ἄρον τὸν ἐπιούσιον as implying the risk of forgetfulness upon the part of the heavenly Father (p. 93). But this would tell equally against any form of prayer. Cf. A. Wabnitz in the *Revue de Théol. et de quest. religieuses*, 1902, pp. 380-85.

² As Karl Lühr argues (*Protest. Monatshefte*, 1903, pp. 64-77), even when the force of such eschatological constructions as those of Baldensperger and others is admitted, this does not remove Jesus from modern Christianity. For, e.g., (i) this hope of the future is not necessarily supernaturalistic. It is implicit in Christian faith. It does not depend either on a belief in catastrophes or upon a non-moral attitude of passive expectation. And (ii) the inward, ethical moment of Christ's teaching is unimpaired. He may be a herald of the kingdom to come, but He is a preacher and a reformer, to boot.

back, curiously enough, upon that given in the Didaché (ix. 5), which makes the logion forbid the eucharist to unbaptized persons. In any case, he observes, the evangelist sees in *what is holy* "une sorte de mystère chrétien, qui n'est pas la simple doctrine de l'Évangile, et c'est ce mystère du culte chrétien dont il défend de livrer la connaissance et, à plus forte raison, la réalité aux païens" (p. 121).

The parable (Luke xi. 5-8) introducing the logion on prayer (Matt. vii. 7-11; Luke xi. 9-13) in the original source, was deliberately omitted by Matthew, we are told, in order to guard against a possible materializing of prayer (pp. 83 f. 122). This theory does not seem very convincing. But at any rate Matthew vii. 7-11 is a detached fragment as it lies in the present Sermon. Like several other passages, it "shows us that the discourses of Jesus, like fragments of granite, could not be dissolved by the flood of oral tradition; but they were not seldom torn from their natural connexion, floated away from their original situation, and deposited in places to which they did not properly belong" (Strauss). Loisy's treatment of the critical presuppositions, however, is not searching enough. He does not penetrate far enough into the problem of the common source or sources upon which both Matthew and Luke depend. Nor does he, I think, allow enough for the possibility of Jesus having spoken at length, in a prophetic harangue,¹ even although most of the extant logia have naturally been preserved in a somewhat isolated form. These considerations, like those of possible translations from the Aramaic, or of the Jewish background, or of the interesting phenomenon of transposition (cf. *Encycl. Biblica*, 4382), are practically ignored in his vivid pages.

JAMES MOFFATT.

¹ One of the merits of Professor Bacon's incisive monograph on the Sermon is to have brought out this feature with convincing clearness.

*THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE EPISTLE TO THE
HEBREWS.*¹

[In this article the contractions ἀλ. and ἀλλ. are used to save space, and, unless otherwise stated, are to be taken as meaning that the word or words thus marked are limited, not absolutely to the books in which they are found, but to these books within the New Testament, and without considering the question of their occurrence once or more than once within these limits.]

WE are now in a fair position for examining the Epistle itself. First of all, let us look at its matter, comparing it with the Third Gospel and *Acts*.

S. Luke's Gospel occupies a curious position. It is classed as Synoptic; but its peculiarities outnumber its coincidences with the Synoptic narrative. Again, in S. Luke's use of the Synoptic narrative, his "economy" has often been noticed; and it is considered sufficient explanation of this "economy" to say that he reproduces none but "representative" facts. There is, however, another element present in his selection of incidents, namely, the bearing of the facts concerned on the relation of Judaism to Christianity and on the "calling of the Gentiles." His peculiar portions, seem especially selected and arranged with reference to this idea. He gives us the Gospel of the Childhood. In it we have the only description of a Temple-service that occurs in the New Testament, and this service is definitely associated with the births of the last of the Prophets and of the Founder of Christianity. In the picture of the aged priest, Zacharias, ministering at the altar, stricken into silence through his failing faith, and roused at last from his dumbness to raise his great song of deliverance—in the meeting of Mary and Elizabeth—in Simeon, weary of the world, but waiting for the redemption of Israel—in the

¹ ERRATA.—Page 77, line 27, for "an" l. "our"; page 79, line 16, for "Peter" l. "Peter."

widowed Hannah—in the Christ-child seated in the House of God, more learned than the doctors of Judaism in the lore of God—in the deep poetic thought of the three great Gospel canticles—we see the figuring forth of S. Luke's full purpose. Behind this great group of pictures, the poet and artist of the Evangelists shows dying Judaism, shorn of its prophetic power, widowed and forlorn; he tells us how, at the Advent of Him whose coming was told "aforetime to the Fathers by the forth-tellers," the dumb religion broke out into its *Te Deum* of joy; he, and he alone, has saved for us the story of how the surroundings of Christ at His birth summed up the meaning of all Revelation that had been and foretold all Revelation that was to be. He, and he only, tells how, when the Father brought the Only-begotten into the world, all the angels of God worshipped Him. And he sets his theme in a few words of supreme poesy. "As He spake by the mouth of His holy prophets, which have been since the world began"; "To perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and to remember His holy covenant: to perform the oath which He sware to our forefather Abraham"; "A light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of Thy people Israel." The Gospel of the Childhood, at least, rings with the same music that sounds through the whole Epistle to the Hebrews.

From this we naturally pass to the more marked peculiarities of S. Luke's historical works as a whole. In his Gospel he tells us very little of our Lord's ministry between His temptation and the going up to His last Passover and His death; but at that point he takes up the tale with special fulness. Two characteristics are thus strongly brought out: (1) The Ox is his emblem, because he most clearly shows our Lord as Priest and Victim. This element comes out most strongly in the special incidents that fall between the beginning of that last journey and the Ascension. (2) Through this whole section there is evidently

a deliberate intention of selecting such incidents as lead up to the thought of the calling of the Gentiles. Thus—not to multiply examples—the “Great Three Days’ Teaching” springs out of the hostility of the Pharisees to this very doctrine; and the Seven Parables that mainly occupy the succeeding Sabbath and the following day have a very evident bearing on the relation, not only of the Pharisees to “publicans and sinners,” but of Judaism to the whole Gentile world.

Thus the lines on which the Third Gospel is laid are directly linked with those of the *Acts*; and there is no difficulty in showing that this is done of set purpose. The earlier portion of the latter book is, not a history of the early Church, but a selection of such incidents in that history as lead up to the preaching of S. Paul; and S. Stephen’s speech, in particular, is a formal *Apologia* for the calling of the Gentiles.

The Epistle to the Hebrews comes naturally as a third book in the same series. In word and thought the author treads in S. Stephen’s footsteps. He follows, logically, the work and teaching of S. Paul. In this only book of the New Testament are unfolded in theory the relation between Judaism and Christianity, the doctrine of Christ’s Priesthood and Sacrifice, the necessary merging of Judaism in a universal Church. The texts already cited from the Gospel canticles might fully form its all-sufficient motto.

So, too, *Hebrews* contains, in its matter, the minor characteristics of S. Luke. His Gospel is the Evangel of the Angels—of the weak and suffering touched by the Divine Compassion of the Christ—of tolerance—of grace.¹ Precisely the same characteristics are to be found in our Epistle.

¹ The word *χαρις* occurs 7 times in S. Luke’s Gospel, 16 times in *Acts*, abundantly in S. Paul’s Epistles—including those which I have marked as “Secondary Lucan,”—10 times in 1 *Peter*, twice in 2 *Peter*, 8 times in *Hebrews*. Outside these limits it is extremely rare.

Again, it is worth noticing the connexion between particular passages in *Hebrews* and parallel passages in S. Luke's acknowledged works. The first quotation in *Hebrews* i. 5 occurs also in *Acts* xiii. 7. The expression "κρείττων γενόμενος τῶν ἀγγέλων" (*Heb.* i. 4) distinctly recalls S. Luke's "ἰσάγγελοι" (*Luke* xx. 36). The opening verses, in their matter, distinctly suggest the Gospel canticles, and the first three words remind us of our Lord's hermeneutic teaching in *Luke* xxiv. 27. The heirship of Christ (*Heb.* i. 2) may be compared with *Luke* xx. 14. The title of Christ as *πρωτότοκος* suggests *Luke* ii. 7.¹ The oath, the covenant, the *εὐλαβεία* (*εὐλαβής* and its related words are, otherwise, exclusively Lucan) are all in *Hebrews*; and there are other quotations in common—such as that found in *Hebrews* viii. 5, and *Acts* vii. 44—which can hardly be due to accident. These are a few of the cases in which we find casual coincidences of thought coming in to strengthen the conclusion one would naturally draw from general coincidence of purpose.

From matter we pass, naturally, to style. S. Luke's style has several well marked peculiarities, which we may take in order:—

(1) The first is perhaps not very important, but it gives us a definite point from which to start. He is particularly fond of alliteration and assonance. So are most writers—partly because alliteration and assonance please the ear, and partly because both bear a large part in the work of association, by which our choice of words is largely guided. Besides, both were reckoned important elements of style in the Hebrew of the Old Testament (as they were also in the Arabic of the Q'ran); and this fact helps to account for their frequent presence in the New Testament. But S. Luke uses both to a larger extent than other New Testament writers; and there seems distinct evidence that he uses

¹ See also *Col.* i. 18.

them with due deliberation and careful choice. Moreover, in both of his books, he paid particular attention to the perfecting of style in his prologues. Set them side by side. In each, the words are carefully chosen, with reference to sound as well as sense. In the Gospel, the opening *ἐπειδήπερ* suggests a series of words beginning with *ἐπ-* and *π*, that runs on into the next verse. Moreover, *ἐπειδήπερ* suggests *ἐπεχείρησαν*, and this, in its turn, suggests the assonance of *διήγησιω* (*ἀ. λ.* in New Testament). So, too, in the prologue to the *Acts*, the alliterative *π*'s echo the opening words of the Evangel, and powerfully suggest the authorship.

But the likeness between these prologues does not end here; they have a common *rhetorical* character. Both are formal antitheses. In the first, we have a definite contrast between the more or less unsatisfactory "treatises" of less well-informed writers and the orderly plan of the Evangelist himself. In the second, we have a sure and sharp severance between the purpose of the Gospel, as embodying the personal earth-work of Christ, and the author's plan of completing this by an account of the Apostolic development of the Church. Thus the two prologues have the same verbal scheme and the same rhetorical character.

The opening of our Epistle has exactly the same literary form—accurately, one would say that it was intermediate in style between the two prologues. Verbally, the alliterative *π*'s extend into the third verse, and (as with *ἐπ-* in the Gospel) so here the sound-system brings in *ἀπ-* in *ἀπαύγασμα*. Then follow a series of *κ*'s, among which we may also notice the vocal relation between *καθαρισμόν* and *ἐκάθισεν*. This vocal system runs through the whole Epistle, and is one of its most marked points of style.

So, too, these verses are strongly antithetical, and the antithesis powerfully resembles that in the prologue to the Gospel. The fragmentary sketches made by the Evange-

list's predecessors are replaced by revelation "πολυμερῶς καὶ πολύτροπος πάλαι" in the Prophets. Great is the power of what we call "accident." It led Whewell, most unpoetic of men, to embody a mechanical law in a Tennysonian stanza, perfect in metre and rhymes.¹ It cast a well-known advertisement into a perfect hexameter, complete even to the cæsura. It grouped the numbers and numerical values of the first verse in *Genesis* (Hebrews and LXX.), the first verse of *S. Matthew*, the names and titles of our Lord, the two Greek names of the Cross, and the number of the Beast, into a most curiously complete arithmetical system. But the first words of *Hebrews* did not fall together by chance—if there be any such thing in a world teeming with coincidences. The orderly biography, again, is replaced by the complete revelation in the Son. For the rest, the plan of the two prologues is exactly the same. Would not any man with an ear and a judgment for style say that they seemed like the work of the same writer?

(2) It has been mentioned that S. Luke's and S. Paul's acknowledged writings both abound in active verbals; but reasons have been given for believing that this idiosyncrasy originated with S. Luke rather than with S. Paul. We may therefore reckon the great redundancy of active verbals in this Epistle as a point in favour of its Lucan origin.²

(3) In my *City of the Living God* I have noticed both the remarkable prevalence of anarthrous substantives in

¹ "So that no force, however great, can stretch a cord, however fine, into a horizontal line that shall be accurately straight."

² There are altogether 147 active verbals used in the New Testament. Of these, 39 occur in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Out of these 39, 10 are ἀλλ. Our Epistle shares 25 with S. Luke and 18 with S. Paul, 3 with the Petrine Epistles, and 5, not being ἀλλ. in *Hebrews*, are shared by *Hebrews* with portions of Scripture outside these limits. (In this note and all other passages bearing on vocabulary I have been obliged to exclude the Apocalypse. Its verbal elements are so peculiar as to make its inclusion not only useless but positively misleading.)

Hebrews, and the extraordinary number of definite articles that have crept into the *Textus Receptus*. Passing by less important passages, two places call for special notice: (a) The famous passage cap. xii. vv. 22-24 incl. contains no definite article, except one (where it would least be expected) before the proper name "Abel." The T.R. of the surrounding verses is full of definite articles rejected by every competent critic. (β) In cap. ix. v. 14, Bishop Westcott was led, through the absence of an article, to deny that the words "Eternal Spirit" signified the Third Person of the Trinity. Now in Westcott and Hort's text—and in all good texts—of the *Acts* the words *πνεύμα ἁγίον* are constantly anarthrous. This is all the more remarkable because critics have been inclined to believe that the presence or absence of the article is a crucial test as to the meaning of these words.

From matter and style we naturally pass to vocabulary. Ignoring words too unimportant to appear in a concordance, the total vocabulary of our Epistle consists of 908 words. Of these 154 are ἁλλ. in the New Testament. Of the remaining 754 words, 612 appear in *S. Luke* or *Acts*, and 50 are altogether, and 43 almost altogether, confined to the Third Gospel, *Acts*, and *Hebrews*. To this we may add the facts that ἁλλ. abound also in the Third Gospel and *Acts*, and that the words peculiar to these writings, peculiar to *Hebrews*, and shared by *Hebrews* with *S. Luke's* two recognized works, seem traceable to the same sources. In fact, there is a remarkably strong verbal relationship between our Epistle, on the one hand, and the acknowledged writings of *S. Luke* on the other.¹

¹ I may mention that the first point which suggested to me, many years ago, the probability of the Lucan authorship of our Epistle, was the observance of a strongly marked common character in the vocabularies of *Hebrews*, the opening chapters of *S. Luke*, and *1 Peter*. The following points may be helpful:—

If the total length of *S. Luke's* Gospel and *Acts* be taken as 14, the

A few words call for special notice: ἀπαύγασμα is undoubtedly a Sophian word from the Apocrypha. The influence of the Sophia-literature in S. Luke's Gospel is distinctly marked. διατίθεμαι is absolutely confined, and ἔθος is limited—save for one passage in S. John's Gospel—to the Third Gospel, *Acts*, and our Epistle. Ἐπαγγελία is prevalently Lucan: in *Hebrews* 14 times. εὐαγγελίζομαι occurs 10 times in the Third Gospel, 15 times in *Acts*, 22 times in S. Paul's Epistles [once in *S. Matt.* and 3 times in 1 *Peter*]. A Lucan and Pauline word, obviously: 3 times in *Hebrews*. Εὐαγγέλιον occurs 61 times in S. Paul's Epistles, 4 times in the First, and 7 times in the Second Gospel, once only in the Apocalypse, once only in 1 *Peter*, twice in *Acts*, never in the Third Gospel, and never in our Epistle. It is hardly possible to over-rate the importance of this argument, resting as it does on the presence and absence of two closely-related words. The case of εὐλαβής¹

Pauline Epistles may be represented by 11, and the Petrine by 1. Now, while the number of words peculiar to a writer will not increase proportionately to the length of his writings, yet, very obviously, length has some influence on their number.

In proportion to length, the Petrine Epistles have a remarkable number of ἀλλ.—128. *Hebrews* has, as we have seen, 154. Of words found only in S. Luke's Gospel and *Acts*, there are 725. S. Paul (excluding *Hebrews*) has 787. For what seems to me to be the true bearing of the last point, see note near end.

In addition to the words noticed in the text, the following are somewhat interesting:

Our Lord is rarely called Ἰησοῦς, without the addition of some title, outside the Gospels. In our Epistle, the name occurs 13 times, and in 7 of these cases it is used without any added title. This looks like the habit of an Evangelist. The titles used for Deity form a striking group: "The Living God," "The Most High God," "The God of Peace," all suggest S. Luke. So do the phrases: "The people of God," "In the presence (ἐνώπιον) of God." In no other book outside the first three Gospels do we find παραβολή. Our author shares with S. Luke's works a decided liking for compounds of προς. Σκηνή is a favourite word with our author—who never uses ναός. Curiously enough, the σκηνοποιός of Tarsus never mentions the σκηνή. The absence of δικαῖω is also remarkable, and a distinctly un-Pauline characteristic.

¹ εὐλαβής: *S. Luke* once, *Acts* twice. εὐλαβεία: *Heb.* twice. εὐλαβέομαι, *Acts, Heb.* once each.

and its congeners has already been considered. A few other examples must suffice. S. Luke alone alludes to the sword-edge as *στόμα μαχαίρης*—where not only the phrase but the Ionic genitive is to be noticed. The same phrase occurs in our Epistle (xi. 37); and, though the T.R. reads *μαχαίρας*, the T.R. is undoubtedly wrong. Again, *κόσμος* occurs 186 times in the New Testament—there being 3 occurrences only in S. Luke's Gospel and 1 in *Acts*: *οικουμένη* 15 times in all—of which 3 are in the Third Gospel and 5 in *Acts*. *Hebrews* has both words: *κόσμος* 5 times and *οικουμένη* twice. *Hebrews* shares with the Third Gospel and *Acts* a peculiar fondness for the word *λαός*. Again both S. Luke and S. Paul would naturally be familiar with the technical military term *παρεμβολή*. But it never occurs in S. Paul's writings; we find it 9 times in the New Testament, i.e., once in the Apocalypse, 5 times in *Acts*, and 3 times in *Hebrews*. Finally, it is not a little curious that three words, on whose meaning the chief questions as to the nature of the Eucharist depend, are found together only in the accounts given by S. Luke and by S. Paul of the institution of that Sacrament, and that these three words—*διαθήκη*, *ποιεῖν*, and *ἀνάμνησις*—are all found in their special technical senses in our Epistle.

Naturally, however, one turns from the consideration of special words to a portion of S. Luke's vocabulary that is universally admitted to be markedly his own—his medical and surgical phraseology. His acknowledged works abound in words used by Greek medical authors, more especially by the master of ancient medicine—Hippocrates. Some of this technical vocabulary, so far as it bears on our Epistle, I have relegated to a note;¹ but for our present purpose

¹ Taking only the words beginning with α and β , and marking the $\acute{\alpha}$.λλ. of *Hebrews* with $\ddot{\tau}$, the following medical or semi-medical words are worth noticing: $\ddot{\tau}$ ἀγνόημα (Theophrastus), ἀγρυνέω (H. and L.), $\ddot{\tau}$ αίσθητήριον, $\ddot{\tau}$ άλυσιτελής, ἀντίτυπος, $\ddot{\tau}$ άρμός, ἀφίστημι (all Hippocratean words). To these we may add ἀναθεωρέω (H. and L.), apparently taken from Theo-

we may find a further examination of a few passages more profitable.

Passing by the Hippocratean words in the first three chapters, we come to the *locus crucialis* in cap. iv. v. 5. Whether the true reading be *συνκεκερασμένους* or *συνκεκερασμένος*, and whether (as Westcott and Hort think probable) *ἀκούσασιν* be, or be not, a primitive error for *ἀκούσασιν*, the best sense of this passage seems to be found by translating the first of these words in its medical sense, "compounded." In the next verse, too, we have the technical term *καταβολή*, which—in the form *κατηβολή*—is cited by Galen from Hippocrates. In cap. xi. v. 11 the same word is found in its strictly technical sense. In vv. 12–14 incl. the whole passage has a medical "flavour," and is replete with medical and physiological terms: *νήπιος*, *στερεὰ τροφή*, *ἔξις*, *αἰσθητήριον*, *γεγυμναζόμενος*, and *διάκρισις*, all fall under this head, and *τελειότης* has a double medical meaning. In cap. xi. v. 11 *καταβολή* is associated with *ἡλικία*, which also has a technical medical sense. *ἀσθενεία* (a favourite Lucan word) and its companion term *ἀσθενής* are the regular Greek medical names for "sickness" and "sick"; and *τέλειος*, with its derivatives, is used by Hippocrates to signify "healthy," etc. The terms are contrasted in cap. vii. v. 28, where they certainly seem to bear their medical meaning.

I shall quote only one more passage in this connexion, and that simply because it is peculiarly interesting, "The Word of God is living and powerful (*ἐνεργής*), and sharper than any two-edged sword," etc. (cap. iv. vv. 12–14). As this is usually interpreted, no one seems to have tried to show what was the exact image in the mind of the writer

phrastus the Physician; *ἀπόλασις*, taken probably from either Hippocrates or Aristotle, and possibly *ἄστρον* (L. and H.). Medical words are plentiful in *S. Luke* and *Acts*, and many may be reckoned in our Epistle; but the fact of their occurring in groups, as in the examples cited in the text, is more important than their mere numbers.

in speaking of the action of the two-edged sword (*μάχαιρα δίστομος*). The simile is, from any point of view, somewhat mixed; but the mixture is slight, if the thought is derived from surgery. *μάχαιρα* was the technical name for a surgeon's knife. In the *Iliad*, the surgeon Machaon (whose name is supposed to be derived from this very word) extracts an arrow with the *μάχαιρα*. S. Chrysostom thinks (erroneously, I believe) that the two *μαχαίραι* owned by the Apostles were knives. Adopting this translation we have a consistent picture, "The Word of God is living and active, sharper than any two-edged knife, and piercing to the severing of soul and of spirit [as the knife pierces to the sundering], of joints and of marrow" (physiological words again). "And [as the parts operated on are visible, bared, and displayed before the surgeon, so] there is no created thing that is not manifest before the face of Christ" (notice the strongly Lucan preposition *ἐνώπιον*, and the essentially Lucan use of *αὐτός* as a synonym for "Christ"), "and all things are bared and exposed before the eyes of Him with whom we have dealings." If *μάχαιρα* be here the surgeon's knife, the other words fall into their places naturally, and the picture is complete.

The case from a comparison of our Epistle with the Third Gospel and *Acts* seems to me extremely strong. It is worth mentioning that it becomes even stronger when we compare the Epistle to the Hebrews with the secondary Lucan works. This, however, must be left to a note.¹

¹ The evidence for a group of "Secondary Lucan documents" rests mainly on the following considerations:—

(1) The historical evidence, as noted in the text, of his presence with S. Paul at the times when the Pastoral Epistles, *Colossians*, and *2 Corinthians* were written.

(2) The evidence for a common style and common vocabulary in these books.

(3) The marks of a similar style in *1 Peter*, and of a curious approach to this style in *2 Peter*.

(4) The evidence of community of style in these documents and in S. Luke's acknowledged works.

The consideration of this question raises and throws light on many side issues, such as the relation between S. Paul

Of (1) no more need be said.

Under (2) we may note the following facts: (a) In most of these Epistles the introductions bear a strong resemblance to S. Luke's habits, already noticed, of alliteration and assonance. (b) There is a clear line of demarcation between the vocabulary of this group, as a whole, and that of the other Pauline Epistles. It will be remembered that the total length of the Pauline Epistles has been reckoned as 11. Taking this for the whole, the "Secondary Lucan group" is represented by 3 and the non-Lucan by 8. Now there are 32 active verbals used in the latter group against 30 in the former. Again, we have seen that the total number of ἀλλ. in the Pauline Epistles is 787. On examining these closely we find three remarkable facts: (i.) They fall for the most part into two definite divisions, corresponding to the two groups in question; (ii.) though the Paulo-Lucan section represents less than $\frac{3}{11}$ of the whole, it has a greater number of ἀλλ. than the other section; (iii.) only a very small proportion of the words peculiar to the Pauline Epistles occurs in both groups. The following table shows the proportions as nearly as I can find them:—

Pauline ἀλλ. (prop. length, 11) . . .	787
Confined to Sec. Lucan group (3) . . .	371, over 47 per cent.
" " non-Lucan group (8) . . .	368, under 47 " "
Common to both groups	48, about 6 " "

(3) It is impossible to enter fully, within my limits, into the Petrine problem: but it can be seen, by examination of the text of the Epistles, that they are marked by the presence of a very large proportion of active verbals (23), and of ἀλλ. (128). The vocabulary of 1 *Peter* has a curious affinity with that of the first two chapters of the Third Gospel. A curious point is the fact that of the Petrine ἀλλ. one only (*ἀπιθεις*) is found in both Epistles. This, together with the general nature of the two Epistles, distinctly suggests that 1 *Peter*—which, on other grounds, has been believed by Dr. Salmon, Dr. Lias and others to be a translation—is, so far as its Greek goes, the work of S. Luke. I cannot here enter fully into the grounds on which I believe this to be highly probable, or into the reasons why 2 *Peter*, with a vocabulary undoubtedly related to that of S. Luke, and drawn in the main from the same sources, appears to me to be an imitation of his style. But they seem sufficient for the inclusion of both Epistles in the Lucan cycle. The proportionate length of the two Petrine Epistles may, roughly, be represented as "1." Adding them to the Lucan group, we get the following figures:—

	ἀλλ.
Pauline Non-Lucan group (8)	368
Secondary Lucan group (4)	499

There are many other facts that point to the unity of the group as a whole and to its very distinctive character.

(4) Taking no account of the Epistle to the Hebrews, I find 130 words in the "Secondary Lucan group" that distinctly point to the influence of

and his secretaries, and the probable history of the Petrine Epistles, on which I cannot now dwell; and I have been

S. Luke's vocabulary. The group, as a whole, abounds in philosophical, physiological and medical terms, and in words drawn from the authors mentioned in the text as sources of the peculiar parts of S. Luke's vocabulary. A few are worth mentioning. The occurrence of *παγls* and *ζωργέω* together in 2 *Timothy* ii. 26 distinctly suggests S. Luke; so do the technical word *στόμαχος* and *ἀσθενεία* in 1 *Timothy* v. 23. Besides these, every Epistle that I have marked as "Secondary Lucan" has ethical and metaphysical words that mark its vocabulary as akin to that of the Evangelist.

If we compare the Epistle to the Hebrews with these books as well as with the Third Gospel and *Acts*, we find the evidence for its Lucan origin greatly strengthened. The text shows that it is akin to the acknowledged works of S. Luke; further examination shows that, where it resembles the Pauline Epistles, it resembles the group in which S. Luke's influence can be traced more than the purely Pauline section. It shares 28 active verbals with the Lucan writings and 18 only with the others. Passing by all points except those that entirely rest on vocabulary, I find that the following table gives a rough view of the facts:—

Words entirely confined to S. Luke (<i>Gosp.</i> and <i>Acts</i>) and <i>Hebrews</i>	50
Words predominantly confined to S. Luke (<i>Gosp.</i> and <i>Acts</i>) and <i>Hebrews</i>	43
Words predominantly confined to Lucan Cycle and <i>Hebrews</i>	47
Words entirely confined to S. Luke, L.C. and <i>Hebrews</i>	19
Words predominantly confined to S. Luke, L.C. and <i>Hebrews</i>	43
Total	202

Thus, out of the 908 words in the vocabulary of *Hebrews*, we have 154 *ἀλλ.*, and 202 that show a distinct connexion with S. Luke, leaving what may be called the "general vocabulary" of the Epistle to be represented by 552 words, about $\frac{1}{8}$ of the whole.

It is worth mentioning (a) that the *ἀλλ.* common to the pure Pauline and the Secondary Lucan Epistles are largely due to the connexion between *Ephesians* and *Colossians* and between 1 and 2 *Corinthians*; and (β) that *Hebrews* resembles *Colossians* much more than *Ephesians*. There are 25 distinct (and sound) references from the A.V. margin of *Hebrews* to *Colossians*. The weight of this fact can best be appreciated by remembering that the latter Epistle is very short, containing only 95 verses. Winer has no theory as to the authorship of *Hebrews*: but his "New Testament Greek Grammar" contains many suggestive analogies. The following points are worth observing:—Cf. H. i. 2 with 2 Cor. xii. 2, as to use of *αἰῶνες*. Lucan use of *αὐτός*, 2 P. iii. 4. S. Luke and our Epistle are especially fond of the use of the Infinitive in oblique cases: A. viii. 11, H. xi. 3, and 1 P. iv. 2, form a unique group in inserting of several words between

obliged, through pressure of space, to give in the text none but the most important points of evidence. But I think I may now fairly summarise the results. (1) The Epistle cannot well be referred to S. Paul. (2) What seems Pauline in it can be accounted for, if S. Luke be the author. (3) Its matter, style, and vocabulary resemble those of S. Luke; and there is a mass of cumulative evidence pointing in the same direction. (4) There seem fair grounds for tracing S. Luke's influence in other books, and these resemble the Third Gospel and *Acts* on the one hand, and *Hebrews* on the other.

A close study of S. Luke's Gospel and the *Acts* cannot fail to impress any reasonably intelligent student with the marvellous power and breadth of culture possessed by its writer, and also with the modesty that led him to keep himself absolutely in the background of his history. The contents of this great anonymous Epistle complete the picture that he drew, and its manner is markedly that of the great poet, philosopher, historian, artist, of the New Testament, who has left of his own life hardly a trace, though he has limned with surest strokes the lineaments of his Master and his fellow-labourers—Lucas, the physician of Antioch.

ALEX. R. EAGAR.

the article and the infinitive. The use of $\tau\epsilon$ is most frequent in *Luke*, *Acts*, and *Hebrews*. For assonance cf. L. xxi. 11, A. xvii. 25, and H. v. 8. The following passages are also worth examining: H. i. 2, with 2 P. i. 9; 1 P. iv. 6, with structure of Lucan hymns: H. i. 3, with A. ii, 33. Many other passages show a grammatical character peculiar to the 3rd Gospel, *Acts*, the L.C. and *Hebrews*.

CHARACTERISTICS OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK.

VI.

IT will not be necessary to attempt here any exhaustive survey of the cases in detail: too full a treatment here will reduce the space available for other fields of grammar which are more important. There are a few noteworthy uses of the *nominative*, which, as we have seen, has a certain tendency to be residuary legatee of case-relations not obviously appropriated by the other cases. We have the use of the nominative as the name-case, unaltered by the construction of the sentence, in Revelation ix. 11: the fact that this has classical parallels is perhaps only accidental, for we have already seen that the Apocalypse has a tendency to use ungrammatical nominatives, and the general New Testament usage is certainly assimilation (Matt. i. 21; Mark iii. 16; Acts xxvii. 1). If *ἐλαιών* is the right accentuation in Luke xix. 29, xxi. 37, we have a nominative which in a writer like St. Luke may well be illustrated by the classical passages supplied by Blass, p. 85. WH., the Revisers, and Blass treat it as *ἐλαιῶν*, gen. pl. I have already remarked (EXPOSITOR, December, 1903, p. 429) on the conclusive evidence which compels us to regard the noun *Ἐλαιών*, *olivetum*, as a word current in the *Κοινή*. WH. (*App.* 158) regard the presence of *Ἐλαιῶνος* in Acts i. 12 as corroborating the argument drawn from the unambiguous *τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν*. Tertullian's *in elaeonem secedebat*, the prevalence of *olivetum* in the Latin versions, and the new fact (unknown to WH.) that *ἐλαιών* is a word abundantly occurring in the vernacular, may together perhaps incline us rather to the other view, with Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Weiss (cf. Dr. Moulton's note in WM. p. 227). Certainly if we were forced to emend on conjecture, to substitute *ἐλαιῶνα* in Luke *ll. cc.*—in one of which places the initial *ἀ* following makes it especially easy—would cause much less disturbance than

to follow Blass's *ἐλαιῶν* in Acts and Josephus. See Deissmann's careful discussion, *B.S.* 208–212.

The parenthetic nominative in expressions of time is well seen in Matthew xv. 32, and Mark viii. 2, a construction which begins in popular Attic as far back as the 5th century B.C.¹ Whether Acts v. 7 belongs to this category, as well as the similar Luke ix. 28, I have already discussed briefly (*EXPOSITOR* for January, p. 74); but perhaps it is not quite as decisive a consideration as I then thought, that the adoption of this means an isolated return to the construction of *ἐγένετο*, which St. Luke used in his Gospel, but then abandoned. The use of parenthetic nominatives appears in the papyri most abundantly in the phrases with *οὐλή* and with *γείτονες*. Thus a description will run "to A., long-faced, straight-nosed, a scar on his right wrist"; and a piece of land or a house is inventoried with "belonging to A., its neighbours on the south the open street, on the west the house of B."—all nominatives without construction. We compare such examples as John i. 6.

There is a very marked increase in the use of the articular nominative in address. Nearly sixty examples of it are found in the New Testament. There seems no sufficient reason for assigning any influence to the coincident Hebrew use, for classical Greek shows it well established. The rough and peremptory tone which characterizes most of the other examples seems to have disappeared. Contrast the Aristophanic *ὁ παῖς ἀκολουθεῖ*, "you there! the lad I mean" (Blass), with the tender *ἡ παῖς ἔγειρε* in Luke viii. 54, where, however, we may recognize a survival of the *decisiveness* of the older use. *Descriptiveness*, however, is rather the note of the articular nominative of address in

¹ See Meisterhans, *Gram. d. att. Inschr.*³ 203. Deissmann (in *Theol. Literaturz.* 1898, p. 629) notes an example from *Acta Pauli et Theclae*, the papyrus text. So also a British Museum papyrus, as read by Crönert in *Cl. Rev.* xvii. 197: *ἐπειδὴ ἀσχολῶ ἐλθὼν πρὸς σὲν αὐτὴ ἡμέρῃ* (=αὐταὶ ἡμέραι, "his diebus").

the New Testament : so Luke xii. 32, John xix. 3, where we may represent the *nuance* by "Fear not, you little flock!"—"Hail, you 'King'!" In the latter passage we can easily feel the inappropriateness of the βασιλεῦ found in **8**, which would admit the royal right, as in Acts xxvi. 7. The anarthrous nominative should probably be regarded as a mere substitute for the vocative, which begins from the earliest times to be supplanted by the nominative. In modern Greek the vocatives in -ε are practically the only separate forms surviving. Hellenistic has little more, retaining some in -α and -εῦ, with the isolated γύναι, πάτερ, and θύγατερ; but the nominative is beginning to assert itself even here, for πατήρ and θυγάτηρ are well attested (see the evidence in Blass, p. 86 n.). The vocative itself need not detain us, the presence or absence of ὦ being the only feature calling for comment. In the Lucan writings only is the interjection used in the classical manner without emphasis. Elsewhere it is mostly used as we use *O*, except that it is with us appropriate in prayer, from which it is markedly absent in the New Testament, though not entirely in the LXX. where there is a Hebrew original. The progressive omission of ὦ is not wholly easy to explain, for the classical examples (see Gerth's Kühner § 357. 4) show that the simple vocative has normally a touch of sharp or peremptory tone. In the New Testament this would suit the presence of ὦ rather than its absence; but there is no reason to explain the development with Buttmann as a Latinism.

Common to nominative and accusative is the use of εἰς with acc. to replace a predicate, in phrases like γίνεσθαι εἰς and ἐγείρειν εἰς (Acts xiii. 22). This use cannot fairly be described as a Hebraism, for the vernacular shows a similar extension of the old use of εἰς expressing destination : cf. for example a papyrus (2nd cent.) from Karanis—ἔσχον παρ' ὑμῶν εἰς δά(νειον) σπέρματα, a recurrent formula. It

is obvious that "I received it *as* a loan" and "*for* a loan" do not differ except in grammar. The fact that this *εἰς* is mainly found in translation falls into line with other phenomena already discussed. A correct locution is overdone in passages based on a Semitic original, simply because it has the advantage of literally rendering a corresponding phraseology in the Hebrew.

We may pass over the accusative, as little remains to be said of it except on points of detail. On the genitive, readers of Winer will perhaps hardly need reminding nowadays that to call the case "unquestionably the *whence-case*" is an utterly obsolete procedure. We have already seen that the ablative, the only case which answers to Winer's "case of *proceeding from or out of*," is responsible for a part of the uses of the genitive with which it united of itself. Most of the ordinary divisions of the case we find still in extensive use. The objective genitive is very prominent, and exegesis has often to discuss the application of this or the subjective label to a particular phrase. It is as well to remember that in Greek the question is entirely one of exegesis, not of grammar. There is no approximation to the development by which we have restricted the inflexional genitive in our language almost entirely to the subjective use. The partitive genitive is largely replaced by the ablative with *ἀπό* or *ἐκ*, but is still used freely, sometimes in peculiar phrases. If *ὀψὲ σαββάτων* in Matthew xxviii. 1 is rightly interpreted by Blass, Zahn, and others, as "late on the sabbath," that is "after the sabbath," we must allow that the partitive genitive was capable of almost indefinite stretching; but the meaning *after* for *ὀψέ*, for which three passages are quoted from Plutarch and Philostratus, would probably come better from the ablative, "late *from*."¹

¹ For the other rendering (R.V. etc.) I may quote a papyrus from Tebtunis (2nd cent. B.C., no. 230), *τῆι προκειμένῃ ια ὀψίτερον τῆς ὥρας*, where

The question of Hebraism is raised again by the genitive of definition. Some of the "long series of phrases" coming under this head "obviously take their origin from Hebrew," says Blass, p. 98. The poetical examples collected in Jebb's note on Sophocles, *Antigone* 114 (or more fully in Kühner-Gerth, p. 264), include some which are quite as remarkable as the "Hebraisms" quotable from the New Testament. Thus *καρδία πονηρὰ ἀπιστίας* (Heb. iii. 12) will pair off well with *τόσονδε τόλμης πρόσωπον* (*Oed. Tyr.* 533). That many of these phrases really are literal translations from the Hebrew need not be questioned, and if an existing usage was adapted for the purpose, we can understand its being overstrained. Our only concern is with passages where no Semitic original is admissible. In these it seems fair to assume that the poetical phraseology of the Attic period had come down into the market-place, as happened also in St. James's *ἀπείραστος κακῶν*, for example.

The rapid extension of the Genitive Absolute is a very obvious feature of the later Greek. In the papyri it may be sometimes seen forming a string of statements, without a finite verb for several lines. In the New Testament we have it freely used in reference to a noun standing in the sentence, without any effort to assimilate the cases. We also find there, as more frequently in the papyri, examples of a participle standing by itself in genitive absolute construction, without noun or pronoun in agreement. The old accusative absolute, from impersonal verbs, has been swallowed up by the genitive in Hellenistic. Cf. the frequent *ἐξόντος* in papyri.

the partitive meaning is undeniable. There remains the old Latin and Vulgate *vespere sabbati*, supported by the Lewis Syriac. So Weiss, Wright, etc.: *ὄψέ* being used very much like an indecl. noun (cf. the late exx. in E. A. Sophocles's *Iexicon*), this seems a natural development, but the question is very difficult to decide. (Blass in his second edition abandons the attempt to get "after" out of "late on," falling back on the evidence for *ὄψέ*—after.)

Finally we may speak of one dative use, that of which ἀκοῇ ἀκούσετε will serve as a type. In giving a list of these phrases, Blass (p. 119—unchanged in ed. 2) remarks that “the usage is an imitation of the Hebrew infinitive absolute like כִּוִּית, כִּוִּית, and is consequently found already in the LXX.”; also that “the analogous classical phrases, such as γάμω γαμεῖν (‘in true wedlock’), φυγῆ φυγεῖν (‘to flee with all speed’), are only accidentally similar to these.” There are two points here on which I should venture to state the case rather differently. It may of course be freely allowed that this construction, and that with the participle (βλέποντες βλέψετε) are examples of “translation Greek.” But in what sense are they *imitations* of the Hebrew? It seems to me that such a description would need something much nearer and more literal, such as ἀκούειν ἀκούσετε. Is it then mere accident that we find the Hebrew locution represented by Greek which recalls respectively the γάμω γαμεῖν and φυγῆ φυγεῖν quoted by Blass, and the well known Aeschylean—

οἱ πρῶτα μὲν βλέποντες ἔβλεπον μάτην,
κλύοντες οὐκ ἤκουον?

The Greek translator, endeavouring to be as literal as he could, nevertheless took care to use Greek that was possible, however unidiomatic. Those who have had to do much in the way of marking classical examination papers, know very well that “possible, but unidiomatic” is a very good general description of the kind of language used by translators who have attained the conscientious accuracy, but not the sure-footed freedom of the mature scholar.

We pass on to the Prepositions, about which, however, there is not much to be said in a general survey like the present, beyond what has come out already. We note the extension of the “Improper” Prepositions, all (except ἐγγύς) with genitive only. “Hebraism” is much to the

fore in this field. Hebrew was supposed to be responsible for the very coining of ἐνώπιον, till Deissmann proved it good vernacular.¹ The compound preposition, ἀνά μέσον, looked the same way, but has turned up abundantly in papyri.² The disappearance of ἀμφί as a separate word, and the virtual extinction of ἀνά, alike pursue a little further what is more than incipient in Attic. We have already seen that the instrumental use of ἐν is really on the lines of pure Greek development, and the same may be said of nearly all its other uses in which the Hebrew ׀ was supposed to be the active factor. Passing over the encroachments of εἰς (p. 464 above), we note the enlargement of the sphere of ἀπό, which encroaches upon ἐκ, ὑπό, and παρά. The title of the modern vernacular Gospels, “μεταφρασμένη ἀπὸ τὸν Ἀλεξ. Πάλλη,” reminds us that ἀπό has advanced further in the interval. The use of prepositions, where classical Greek would have been content with a simple case, such as for partitive sense, and to express material (as Matt. xxvii. 21, iii. 4), enables ἐκ to outnumber ἀπό still, though obsolete to-day.

peculiar uses of these prepositions must be neglected here. Πρό in John xii. 1, 2 Corinthians xii. 2, raises the possibility of a Latinism, *ante diem tertium kalendas*, as in John xi. 18, ὡς ἀπὸ σταδίων δεκαπέντε resembles *a millibus passuum duobus* (see Blass, pp. 126, 95). The question of the recognition of Latinism must be reserved, but I may quote here³ three examples of this construction from the second century A.D., which show that it was a thoroughly naturalized idiom. One of these, parallels for which may be seen in Viereck's *Sermo Graecus* in the dates affixed to translated decrees, runs πρὸ ἰε̄ καλανδῶν Ἀύγουστων. Since

¹ *Bible Studies*, p. 213. Cf. EXPOSITOR, February, 1903, p. 113. The word will now be found also in O.P. 658 (250 A.D.), in the formula of a *libellus*.

² Not, however, in any use which would help 1 Corinthians vi. 5, where it is almost impossible to believe that the text is sound.

³ References given in *Cl. Rev.* xviii. 152 (April, 1904).

this clear imitation is found three or four centuries earlier in inscriptions, it is not difficult to conceive the official phraseology being extended. But the construction must have been very much at home to produce *μετ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἕνα τῆς τελευτῆς μου* and the illiterate *πρὸ δύο ἡμερῶν ἀγόρασον τὰ ὀρνιθήρια τῆς εἰορτῆς* ("buy the fowls two days before the feast"). I strongly suspect that the roots of this usage lay as much in the vernacular itself as in the Latin formula which is assumed to have produced it.¹

We are back among "Hebraisms" when we look at the compound prepositions which are made so freely with *πρόσωπον*, *χείρ* and *στόμα* (Blass, 129 f.). They started of course in literal translation, and held their ground, like all other locutions to which the name of Hebraism may properly be given, by the conscious use of Biblical phrases, such as may be abundantly paralleled in the style of Englishmen whose minds are saturated with Bible language.

Of the prepositions with two cases, *διὰ* and *μετά* show no signs of weakening their hold on both; but *κατά* c. gen. and *περί*, *ὑπέρ* and *ὑπό* c. acc. are distinctly falling behind. *Κατά*, like *ἀνά*, is used as an adverb distributively. The distinction between *περί* and *ὑπέρ* c. gen. is growing dull, and in the passages where these prepositions are used to describe the relation of the Redeemer to man, or man's sins, it would probably be prudent not to rest much theology on the distinction. With three cases *ἐπί* alone remains entirely at home, and here there is a great deal of confusion. *Πρός* c. gen. and dat. is all but obsolete, and *παρά* c. dat. is being undermined.

There is little to say under the head of Adjectives, except on the important "Duality" question raised by the phenomena of comparison. The question touches the use of dual pronouns of the *ἕτερος* class, as well as the relation

¹ I have just noticed in Herodotus (vi. 46) *δευτέρῳ ἔτει τούτων*, which is essentially the same.

between comparative and superlative: it is really one with the tendency which destroyed the dual. The abolition of a distinction between duality and plurality is almost inevitable sooner or later in language history. English affords us instructive parallels. The simplicity and convenience of our suffixes *-er* and *-est* have preserved in common speech the old degrees of comparison. But how often does the man in the street say "the better of the two"? I should not like to say offhand how far in this matter modern literature is impeccable on Lindley Murray standards; but I fancy that in conversation the most correct of us may be caught tripping, and even when the comparative is used we are almost conscious of a kind of pedantic accuracy. That "the best of the two" is the English of the future is a fairly safe assertion. "Whether," adjectivally, is as obsolete as *πότερος*:¹ when we translate *τίνα ἀπὸ τῶν δύο* (Matt. xxvii. 21) by the archaism "whether of the twain," we are only advertising the fact that the original was normal speech and our translation artificial. We have not yet arrived at "either of the three," but we can say "either A. or B. or C." without a qualm. Of course the first step was taken ages ago in the extinction of the dual, the original existence of which in Germanic may be seen from Wulfila's Gothic. Other modern languages tell the same tale. In the New Testament the obsolescence of the superlative, except in the *elative* sense, is most marked. It is mere chance that only one example of the *-τατος* superlative has survived,² for there are scores of them in the papyri. In the genuine superlative sense, however, the examples there are very rare; practically we may say that in the vernacular documents the superlative forms are used to express the sense of our "very." The confusion of

¹ I have eleven papyrus collections by me, with *one* occurrence of *πότερος* in the indices, and that is nearly illegible and (to me, at least) quite unintelligible (*Amh. Pap.* 135, second cent.).

² Acts xxvi. 5, in true superlative sense; the speech is much affected by literary style.

comparative and superlative is well seen in some illiterate papyri, where phrases like τὸ μέγιστον καὶ γνησιώτερον occur. One or two typical examples of irregular comparatives may be cited—the references may be found with other examples in *Class. Rev.* xv. 439 and xviii. 154. Specially instructive is the papyrus of the astronomer Eudoxus, written in the second century B.C. There we have καθ' ὃν ὁ ἥλιος φερόμενος τὴν μὲν ἡμέραν βραχυτέραν ποιεῖ τὴν δὲ νύκτα μακροτέραν. The sense demands superlative, and Blass no doubt rightly assumes that the fourth century author wrote βραχυτάτην and μακροτάτην. In that case the scribe's alteration is very significant. He has in the same way altered μεγίστη to μειζώνει in another place, and he writes ἐν ἑκατέρῳ τῶν ζωιδίων for "in each of the (twelve) signs." A Ptolemaic papyrus has ἐν μείζονι ἀξιώματι, an elative comparative. The phrase σοῦ πρώτος εἰμι (second or third cent.) shows that in this word it was the superlative which ousted the comparative, and not *vice versâ* as elsewhere. It is reasonable to argue from all the new evidence that the R.V. marginal note should be dispensed with in John i. 15, 1 Corinthians xiii. 13, Matthew xviii. 1, and the like. And in Acts i. 1 we must allow that the mere use of πρώτος can prove very little when we ask whether St. Luke meant to write a third treatise. Πρότερος is very rare in the papyri, though not extinct. Ramsay himself admits (*Paul the Traveller*, p. 28) that the absence of the word from Lucan writings precludes certainty for his point. The case is not quite so strong for the pronouns. There are plenty of places where ἕτερος, ἑκάτερος, ὁπότερος, etc., are used of more than two, and ἄλλος of two only; but also places where they are used carefully according to classical precedent. It seems to me a fair assumption that these words were in much the same condition as was described just now for our own comparative and superlative in phrases like "the better (best) of two." Educated men would know the distinction and observe it unless off their guard.

In these cases we must let the context decide, paying due attention to the degree of grammatical precision usually attained by each several author.

A difficulty under this head is raised by Acts xix. 16, which I briefly discussed in the EXPOSITOR for last December (viii. 426). The probability that ἀμφότεροι may be used for πάντες in a second century document, and two clear examples of it from the fourth, with the undeniable Byzantine use, form a strong temptation where the relief would be so great. I cannot but think that Ramsay is quite right in saying (*Paul the Traveller*, p. 272), "The seven sons in v. 14 change in an unintelligible way to two in v. 16 (except in the Bezan text)." St. Luke must have been a very slovenly writer if he really meant this, and the Bezan reading of v. 14 does not help us to understand how the more difficult "neutral text" arose if it really was secondary. On the other hand, St. Luke is the very last New Testament writer whom we should expect to yield to a colloquialism of which there is no certain example for another three centuries. If we are to defend these verses from Ramsay's criticisms—and in a purely grammatical discussion I must not deal with them except on this side—must we not assume that the original text of v. 14 is lost? If it contained a fuller statement, the abruptness of τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ πονηρὸν in v. 14, and of our ἀμφοτέρων, might be removed without sacrificing the characteristic ἐπτά. (It might also give us a more satisfactory statement as to Sceva's office.) The alternative is to suppose the verses an interpolation from a less educated source, imperfectly assimilated to St. Luke's style. It should be observed that the Sahidic and the later Syriac understood ἀμφοτέρων to mean "all," as also the Roman Ethiopic. But we must not trespass on the preserves of the critics, whether higher or lower; we only ask them to untie between them a knot the difficulty of which has hardly been adequately recognized.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

ST. JAMES V. 14, 15.

MANY men of widely different opinions, setting out from widely distant standpoints, have of late arrived by converging paths at something like a general agreement as to what may conveniently be termed "spiritual healing," and it seems worth while to look closely into the chief passage in the New Testament on which all Christian views on the subject must be founded.

The passage seems to be written with extreme care and in accurate sequence, six steps or gradations being carefully marked.

Some one "in the Church" is sick. This of course is given as a specific case of the suffering (*κακοπαθεῖ*) mentioned in verse 13.

(1) He is to call for the elders of the Church, not merely for prayer to be offered out of his sight on his behalf—a private friend or single minister might do that—but that the sick man may have the comfort and help of having before his eyes the whole Church as it were. "Qui dum orant," says Bengel, "non multo minus est quam si tota oraret ecclesia."

(2) They are to pray "over him" (*ἐπ' αὐτόν*). A definite visible sign before his very eyes.

(3) Anointing him—or having anointed, R.V. margin—with oil in the name of the Lord. The aorist *ἀλείφαντες* may, as is well known, denote contemporaneous action, or the anointing may have preceded the prayer. This seems immaterial. The point is that the sick man may have the further help given by an outward and visible sign.

The use of the oil may conveniently be termed religious. It is to act through the mind and spirit. All notes written on the use of oil as a physical remedy seem beside the point. It was of course a common vulnerary remedy, as in

Luke x. 34, of the good Samaritan, ἐπιχέων ἔλαιον καὶ οἶνον, but there is no suggestion of any wound or organic mischief here, and however generally oil may have been used as a physical remedy, it could scarcely be applied in all cases of ἀσθένεια. St. James' directions are quite general and without limitation.

The ἡλειφον ἐλαίῳ of Mark vi. 13 can scarcely have been the application of physical remedies. Rather "they anointed with oil—for 'spiritual healing'—many who were sick, καὶ ἐθεράπευον and treated them medically."

(4) And the prayer of faith shall "save" the "sick" man.

σώσει surely must refer to physical soundness, or rather "improvement" in a physical sense. There has been no reference yet to the spiritual state of the sufferer, and to intrude a spiritual reference here, with ἐγερεῖ, obviously physical, immediately following, would be extremely harsh. Nor can we suppose in such a definite passage that the spiritual sense underlies the physical.

But σώσει cannot simply mean "make whole," or ἐγερεῖ would be an otiose repetition of the same idea (except in so far as it has a new subject); we must look therefore for some early stage in the recovery, and this σώσει will furnish if, as seems to be the case, it will bear the meaning of "bring him into the way of getting better." Make him, that is, a σωζόμενος in the physical sense, just as the σωζόμενος spiritually (e.g. in Acts ii. 47) is one who is in the way of spiritual salvation.

The use of σώζειν in the New Testament, in the sense of cause to recover bodily health, is of course well established, but it seems not to occur except here in the *inceptive* sense unless it be in John xi. 12, of Lazarus, εἰ κεκοίμηται σωθήσεται, "if he has fallen asleep he will *do well*," or begin *to get better*, as we say. Not necessarily "recover" finally. It was too early as yet to speak of recovery. Of course

there could not have been in the Apostles' minds, when they spoke, any thought of spiritual salvation for Lazarus.

A classical parallel is Antiphon 116. 26 (Reiske), ὅταν δὲ νοσήσωσιν ὑγιεῖς γινόμενοι σώζονται, "get better and are healed."

τὸν κάμνοντα, to return to the passage in St. James, may be only "him that is sick," and Mayor, in his note *ad loc.*, says: "I see no ground for the distinction made by some between ἀσθενῶ and κάμνω." But why should St. James substitute for the former the latter far less usual word? κάμνειν of course may be simply, like *laborare*, to be ill. But here I would render "him who is losing heart," "giving up the fight" (for life); cf. Hebrews xii. 3, ἵνα μὴ κάμητε ταῖς ψυχαῖς, "that ye may not flag spiritually," ταῖς ψυχαῖς being joined closely with the verb. Cf. οἱ κεκμηκότες in classics, those who have finally given up the battle of, or for, life—the dead.

The outward and visible signs, the elders praying and the oil, are just what ὁ κάμνων needs to help in his recovery.

(5) "And the Lord will raise him up," ἐγερεῖ of physical healing still. The stress is on ὁ κύριος. The elders do their part, the ὁ κάμνων takes fresh heart, joins in the prayer of faith, but it is the Lord who is the real healer.

"I applied the remedies, the Lord was the healer," is the translation of a striking inscription in the ward of a French hospital, possibly suggested by these words of St. James.

The whole stress of the passage then up to this point is on physical healing by spiritual means. It may be objected that, if this view be taken and the oil has only a religious efficacy, St. James ignores all ordinary medical aid. He does so, possibly, because the healing art among those to whom he wrote was still in an elementary stage, or far more probably, because he is writing solely to the Church as such; it is not his *métier* to address the faculty of medicine or to consider its methods.

(6) And *even if* he have committed sins, it shall be forgiven him." *Kāv*, "even if" (not "if," as in R.V.). The connexion of sin with sickness, and the fact that it is a hindrance to recovery, is no doubt implied, but not, it would seem, its necessary connexion in every case of sickness.

The promise is added still with the failing flagging spirit in view; "can I recover, and can my sin be forgiven?" is the natural thought of *ὁ κάμνων*.

The elaborate nature of the proposed method of cure as compared with what we find in the Gospels may fairly be considered as adding some little weight to the arguments for a late rather than an early date for the Epistle.

J. H. DUDLEY MATTHEWS.

[It was not until the above was in type that I had the advantage of seeing "The Anointing of the Sick," by the Rev. F. W. Puller—J.H.D.M.]

TRANSLATIONS FROM THE PROPHETS.

XII.

JEREMIAH XLVIII.—XLIX.

*The Pride of Moab is humbled; her Vineyards and Winepresses are ruined; and the whole Land is given over to mourning.**

²⁹ We† have heard of the pride of Moab, he is very proud; his loftiness, and his pride, and his arrogancy, and the haughtiness of his heart. ³⁰ I know, saith Yahweh, his wrath, and his boastings are untruth;‡ they do untruth.

* This paragraph is largely a mosaic, constructed of reminiscences of Isa. 15-16.

† See Isa. 16. 6.

‡ Rendered by many moderns, though questionably, *and the untruth of his boastings*. The same Heb. is found in Isa. 16. 6 *end*.

³¹ Therefore will I howl for Moab, and I will cry out for all Moab; * for the men † of K̄ir-heres will I ‡ moan. §
³² With more than the weeping || of Jazer, will I weep for thee, O vine of Sibmah: thy tendrils passed over ¶ the sea, ** they reached even unto †† Jazer; upon thy summer fruits and upon thy vintage the spoiler is fallen. ‡‡ ³³ And §§ gladness and joy are taken away from the fruitful field, and from the land of Moab; and I have caused wine to cease from the winevats: none shall tread with shouting; ||| the shouting shall be no shouting. ¶¶ ³⁴ From [*or* Because of]

* Varied from Isa. 16. 7*a* (where 'Moab' is the subject of the verbs).

† Varied from Isa. 16. 7*b* by the change of 'raisin-cakes' (רִשְׁתִּים) into 'men' (אֲנָשִׁים). K̄ir-heres, the K̄ir-heréseth of Isa. 16. 7, 2 Kings 3. 25, was probably Kerak, 18 miles S. of the Arnon, and 8 miles E. of the Dead Sea, a strongly fortified place, situated on a very steep rocky hill, surrounded by deep ravines.

‡ The Heb. has *will one*, but the context requires the first person (one letter different).

§ With a low, plaintive cry, resembling the note of the dove: cf. the same Heb. word in Isa. 38. 14, 59. 11 (where 'mourn' in A.V., R.V., as in the present passage, does not mean to *grieve* or *sorrow*, but is equivalent to 'moan').

|| Read probably, as Isa. 16. 9*a*, *With the weeping* (ב for ד); i.e. as Jazer weeps, so will I.

¶ Or, perhaps, *over to*.

** I.e. the Dead Sea (so Isa. 16. 8*d*). Sibmah, mentioned also Num. 32. 3 (Sēbām), 38, Josh. 13. 19, according to Jerome near Heshbon, and so perhaps the modern *Sūmia*, 2½ miles WNW. of Heshbon, must have been famous for its vines (cf. Isa. 16. 8, 9), and this verse must describe the area over which the vines derived from Sibmah extended: N.-wards, to Jazer (according to Eusebius, 15 miles N. of Heshbon), W.-wards, over—or at least (see the last footnote) to—the Dead Sea'—Isa. (16. 8) adds E.-wards also towards the wilderness.

†† So LXX. and Isa. 16. 8*c*: in the Heb. ('† the sea of Jazer') 'sea' (ים) has no doubt been accidentally repeated from the previous clause.

‡‡ Varied from Isa. 16. 9*c* (בצִירךְ 'thy vintage' for קצִירךְ 'thy harvest'; and שָׂרַר 'the spoiler' for הִירָר 'the shout').

§§ This verse is varied from Isa. 16. 10.

||| Heb. *hēdād*, the joyous shout, or huzzah, of the vintagers, as they trod the juice out of the grapes in the winepresses: cf. on 25. 30.

¶¶ I.e. the huzzah of the grape treads will be no true huzzah: it will become the huzzah of the attacking foe (25. 30, 51. 14, Isa. 16. 9—in all the same word *hēdād*).

the cry of Heshbon even unto Elealeh,* even unto Jahaz have they uttered their voice, from Zoar even unto Horonaim and † the third Eglath: ‡ for the waters of Nimrim also shall become desolate.§ ³⁵ And I will cause to cease from Moab, saith Yahweh, him that offereth in || the high place, and him that burneth incense to his god. ³⁶ Therefore mine heart soundeth for Moab like pipes, and mine heart soundeth like pipes for the men of Kirheres: ¶ therefore the abundance that he hath gotten** is perished. ³⁷ For every head is bald, and every beard clipped: upon all hands are gashes, and upon all †† loins is sackcloth. ‡‡ ³⁸ Upon all the housetops of Moab and in the broad places thereof everyone is wailing: §§ for I have broken Moab like a vessel wherein is no pleasure, saith Yahweh. ³⁹ How is it dismayed! (how) do they howl! how hath Moab turned the back with shame! thus Moab shall become a derision and a dismaying to all that are round about him.

The Final Doom of Moab.

⁴⁰ For thus saith Yahweh: Behold one like unto an

* These words, taken in conjunction with what follows, yield no intelligible sense: some verb is desiderated (as in the original, Isa. 15. 4, 'Heshbon *crieth out*, and Elealeh'). Read perhaps, adding one letter (Giesebrecht), *How criest thou, O Heshbon and* (so LXX.) *Elealeh!* Elealeh, now *el-'Al*, was 2 miles NE. of Heshbon.

† So LXX. The Heb. text omits *and*. Cf. Isa. 15. 5.

‡ Here also the text seems to be defective. Perhaps some such words as *Moab calleth out* should be inserted after 'the third Eglath.'

§ Heb. *desolations* (so Isa. 15. 6). The meaning is, they will be dried up, their sources being stopped by the enemy (cf. 2 Kings 3. 25).

|| So with the change of a point (lit. *the offerer of*). Or render, *him that bringeth up* (viz. a procession of worshippers), etc. Or read, with LXX., *him that goeth up to* (one letter omitted). (The Heb. text, as pointed, cannot be rendered, 'him that offereth in.')

¶ Varied from Isa. 16. 11.

** From Isa. 15. 7*a*.

†† Insert *all* with LXX. Vulg.

‡‡ Marks of mourning: cf. on 16. 6, 47. 5.

§§ With *vv.* 37, 38*a*, comp. Isa. 15. 2*c*, 3.

eagle * shall swoop and spread out his wings against Moab. ⁴¹ Keriyyoth † is taken, and the fortresses are seized, and the heart of the mighty men of Moab in that day shall be as the heart of a woman in her pangs. ⁴² And Moab shall be destroyed from being a people, because he hath magnified himself against Yahweh. ⁴³ Fear, ‡ and the pit, and the trap, are upon thee, O inhabitant of Moab, saith Yahweh. ⁴⁴ He that fleeth from the fear shall fall into the pit; and he that getteth up out of the pit shall be taken in the trap: for I will bring upon her (even) upon Moab, the year of their visitation, § saith Yahweh. ⁴⁵ Under the shadow of Heshbon they that fled stand without strength: ¶ for ¶ a fire is gone forth out of Heshbon, and a flame from the house ** of Sihon, and it hath devoured the temples of Moab's head, and the crown of the head of the sons of tumult. †† ⁴⁶ Woe unto thee, O Moab! the people of Chemosh is undone: for thy sons are taken away captive, and thy daughters into captivity. ⁴⁷ Yet †† will I turn the

* Properly a vulture. See Tristram's *Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, p. 173 f.

† An important city of Moab, mentioned also in Am. 2. 2, and by Mesha in his Inscription (the 'Moabite Stone'), l. 13, where he says that he 'dragged before Chemosh in Keriyyoth' (presumably in his sanctuary there) an altar-hearth which he had captured from the men of Gad in 'Atāroth (Num. 32. 3, 34). Its site is uncertain.

‡ With *vv.* 43, 44a, comp. Isa. 24. 17, 18: one has evidently been adapted from the other.

§ Cf. ch. 11. 23, 23. 12.

¶ In vain do the fugitive Moabites seek protection in Heshbon; for Heshbon is the starting-point of the conflagration which is to destroy Moab (cf. *v.* 2).

¶¶ *Vv.* 45b, 46, are based, with slight variations, upon Num. 21. 28a, b, 24. 17e, f, 21. 29a, b, c, d. (In the Heb. 'the crown of the head of' [קרקר] differs extremely little from 'break down' [קרקר].)

** So, changing one letter (מבית for מבין), 'house of Sihon' being a poetical designation of Heshbon, Sihon's old capital (Num. 21. 26, Deut. 2. 26, *al.*). The Heb. text has *from the midst*, which yields no satisfactory sense. Num. 21. 28 has 'from the city (מקירת) of Sihon.'

†† Or, *of the* (battle-)din (cf. the same word in 25. 31; Hos. 10. 11; Am. 2. 2), i.e. Moab's martial warriors.

‡‡ The prophecy ends with a promise of ultimate restoration: cf. 46. 26b, 49. 6; also 12. 15.

captivity of Moab in the latter days, saith Yahweh.
Thus far is the judgement upon Moab.*

XLIX. ¹ On the children of Ammon.

*The Ammonites are threatened with Retribution for taking
to themselves the Territory of Gad.†*

Thus saith Yahweh: Hath Israel no sons? hath he no heir? why then doth Milcom ‡ inherit Gad, and his people dwell in the cities thereof? § ² Therefore, behold, the days come, saith Yahweh, that I will cause the shout of battle || to be heard against Rabbah of the children of Ammon; and it shall become a desolate mound, ¶ and her daughters ** shall be burned with fire: then shall Israel inherit them that did inherit him, saith Yahweh. ³ Howl, O Heshbon, for Ai †† is laid waste; cry, ye daughters of Rabbah, gird you with sackcloth: wail, and run to and fro among the

* A compiler's note, stating that the prophecy on Moab ends here.

† The territory of Gad was on the E. of Jordan, from Heshbon at least as far N. as the Jabbok (cf. Josh. 13. 14-28; Num. 32. 34-36: but the details do not entirely agree; see GAD in *D.B.*): the Ammonite territory was on the E. of this, their principal city Rabbah (called by the Greeks *Philadelphia*, now *Ammān*) being 14 miles NE. of Heshbon, and 24 miles E. of the Jordan.

‡ So LXX. (Μελχολ), Pesh. Vulg. The Heb. text, as pointed, has *Malcam*, which would mean 'their king.' Milcom was the national god of the Ammonites (1 Kings 11. 5, 33; 2 Kings 23. 13).

§ I.e. Has Israel no children of its own, that the Ammonites should have taken possession of this portion of its territory?

|| Cf. 4. 19; Am. 1. 14.

¶ Heb. *tēl*, familiar now, in its Arabic form *Tell*, as the name of many 'mounds' in Palestine concealing the remains of ancient cities. So Deut. 13. 16, Josh. 8. 28 (see R.V.m.).

** Fig. for surrounding towns or villages. So Num. 21. 25, 32. 42; Josh. 15. 45; Jud. 1. 27, 11. 26 (see R.V.m.), *al.*

†† Heshbon was a *Moabite* city (48. 2, 34, 45), so that it is difficult to understand why it should be mentioned in a prophecy on Ammon; and Ai is an otherwise unknown place. Duhm's conjecture, removing both these difficulties, is a clever one: *Howl, O palace* (ארמון for השבון; cf., though the Hebrew word is different, Am. 8. 3 R.V.m.), *for the city* (עי for העיר) *is laid waste*; the palace and city will then be those of Rabbah (2 Sam. 12. 27), which is the subject of the context, both before (v. 2) and after (v. 3).

(sheep-)folds; for Milcom* shall go into exile, his priests and his princes together.† 4 Why gloriest thou in the vales, (that) thy vale floweth (with fertility), ‡ O backturning daughter? § that trusted in her treasures, that said, ¶ ‘ Who shall come unto me?’ 5 Behold, I will bring a fear upon thee, saith the Lord, Yahweh of hosts, from all that are round about thee; and ye shall be driven out every man right forth ¶¶; and there shall be none to gather up him that wandereth. 6 Yet afterward I will bring back the captivity of the children of Ammon, saith Yahweh.

7 On Edom.

Thus saith Yahweh of hosts: Is** wisdom no more in Teman? †† is counsel perished from the prudent? is their wisdom vanished? ‡‡ 8 Flee ye, turn back, dwell deep, §§ O inhabitants of Dedan; ¶¶¶ for the calamity of Esau have I brought upon him, (even) the time that I visit him. ¶¶¶ 9 If

* Heb. text *Malcam*. See on v. 1.

† Varied from Am. 1. 15. Cf. ch. 48. 7.

‡ The expression is peculiar, and doubtful: note that ‘with fertility’ has to be supplied to make sense. It is possible that some letters have been repeated by error, and that we should read simply, *Why gloriest thou in thy vales?* (or, *in the multitude of thy vales?*): see the note, p. 148.

§ Cf. 31. 22 (of Ephraim).

¶ So LXX. Pesh. Targ. Vulg. ‘That said’ (האמרה) has accidentally dropped out in the Heb. Cf. 21. 13; Obad. 3; Zeph. 2. 15.

¶¶ Heb. *before himself*, i.e. straight forward (cf. Am. 4. 3).

** In this prophecy on Edom, v. 7 is similar to Obad. 8, and vv. 9-10a, 14-16, are largely identical, or nearly so, with Obad. 5-6, 1-4, respectively. The common passages are based probably upon some older prophecy, which Jer. and Obad. each adapt in his own way.

†† A district in the N. of Edom: cf. Am. 1. 12; Ez. 25. 13. See also Gen. 36. 11 (where the clan inhabiting it is personified as a ‘son’ of Eliphaz, the ‘son’ of Edom), 15, 42 (where the ‘duke,’ i.e. leader [Vulg. *dux*; LXX. ἡγεμόν], or clan-chief, of Teman is spoken of).

‡‡ Heb. *let go*. Or, if the word should be explained from the Aramaic, *corrupted* (see EXPOSITOR, May, 1897, p. 363).

§§ I.e. hide yourselves in inaccessible places.

¶¶¶ Neighbours of Edom on the SE. (cf. Isa. 21. 13; Ez. 25. 13), who are here bidden to take flight, if they wish to escape Edom’s fate.

¶¶¶ Cf. 46. 21.

grapegatherers come to thee, they will leave no gleanings; if thieves by night, they will destroy till they have enough.

¹⁰ For I have made Esau bare, I have disclosed his lurking-places, and he shall not be able to hide himself*: his seed is spoiled, and his brethren, and his neighbours, and he is not. ¹¹ Leave thy fatherless children, I will preserve them alive; and let thy widows trust in me.

¹² For thus saith Yahweh: Behold, they to whom it pertained † not to drink of the cup ‡ shall assuredly drink; and art thou he that shall go altogether unpunished? thou shalt not go unpunished, but thou shalt surely drink. ¹³ For I have sworn by myself, saith Yahweh, that Bozrah § shall become a desolation, a reproach, a waste, and a curse; and all the cities thereof shall be perpetual wastes. ¹⁴ A rumour from Yahweh have I heard, and an ambassador is sent among the nations, (saying,) 'Gather yourselves together, and come against her, and rise up to the battle.'

¹⁵ For, lo, I make thee small among the nations, (and) despised among men. ¹⁶ O thy trembling!|| the pride of thine heart hath deceived thee, O thou that dwellest in the clefts¶ of the crags, that holdest the height of the hill: though thou shouldest make thy nest high like the eagle,** even thence would I bring thee down, saith Yahweh. ¹⁷ And

* So, rightly, AV. RV.; but the rendering implies a change in the Massoretic vocalization.

† Lit. *whose judgement* (or *sentence*, or *right*) *it was*.

‡ I.e. the cup of Yahweh's anger; see ch. 25. 15 ff., esp. 28f. If even Israel has to drink of this cup, surely Edom cannot expect to escape it.

§ A city in the N. of Edom (Am. 1. 12; Isa. 34. 6, 63. 1), now *Buṣaireh*, about 20 miles SE. of the Dead Sea.

|| I.e. What trembling will seize thee in the day of thy fall! Others, however, suppose the meaning to be *O the trembling* (or *horror*) *for thee!* i.e. What dread thy fall will inspire into those who witness it! But the expression is peculiar, and the text open to suspicion. The word (which is not in Obad. 5) is, if correct, cognate with the one rendered *tremble* in Job 9. 6, and with that rendered *horror* in Ps. 55. 5, Isa. 21. 4 (R.V.).

¶ Properly *refuges* or *retreats* (see Lane, *Arab. Lex.* 523c).

** Properly *the vulture*. See on 48. 40.

Edom shall be a desolation : * every one that passeth by it shall be appalled, and hiss because of all the strokes thereof. †
 18 As in the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah and the neighbour cities thereof, ‡ saith Yahweh, no man shall dwell there, neither shall a son of man sojourn therein.
 19 Behold, there shall come up one like a lion from the pride of Jordan § against the enduring habitation : || for in a moment will I chase them away from it ; and whosoever is chosen, him will I appoint over it : ¶ for who is like me ? and who will fix a time for me ? ** and who is the shepherd that can stand before me ? †† 20 Therefore hear ye the counsel of Yahweh, that he hath taken against Edom, and his purposes, that he hath purposed against the inhabitants of Teman : Surely they shall drag them, (even) the smallest of the flock ; ‡‡ surely he shall make their homestead appalled because of them. §§ 21 At the noise of their fall the earth trembleth ; there is a cry, the sound whereof is heard in the Red Sea. 22 Behold, ||| one like unto an eagle shall mount up and swoop, and spread out his wings against

* Or, *an appalment* : cf. 19. 8.

† Repeated from 19. 8b.

‡ I.e. Admah and Zeboiim (Gen. 10. 19, 14. 2, 8). See Deut. 29. 23 ; and cf. Hos. 11. 8.

§ I.e. the luxuriant growth of bushes and thick vegetation along the banks of the Jordan, which was anciently the haunt of lions (see Zech. 11. 3, and comp. on 12. 5).

|| Heb. *homestead* (see on 31. 23) *of permanency*, i.e. an abode of long standing, and likely to endure.

¶ The Edomites are compared to a flock against whom Yahweh is about to send a foe (figured as a lion) who will speedily expel them from their homestead : He will then appoint over their land as ruler whom He pleases. 'For' gives the reason why a *lion* is to be sent against Edom.

** I.e. who will summon me to meet him in a court of law, or in a trial of strength ? Exactly the same expression occurs in Job 9. 19.

†† I.e. what shepherd (fig. for ruler, as 25. 34-36, etc.) can defend his flock (people) against me ?

‡‡ The Edomites are here compared to the smallest and most helpless of a flock, whom their enemies will drag along, and treat as they please, like dogs (15. 3, 22. 19).

§§ Or, *desolate upon them*.

||| The same words which in 48. 40b, 41b, are used of Moab.

Bozrah ; and the heart of the mighty men of Edom in that day shall be as the heart of a woman in her pangs.

²³ On Damascus.

Hamath is put to shame, and Arpad ;* for they have heard evil tidings, they are melted away : † because of care, like the sea, they cannot rest. ‡ ²⁴ Damascus is waxed feeble, § she turneth herself to flee, and trembling hath seized on her : || anguish and sorrows have taken hold of her, as of a woman in travail. ²⁵ 'How is the city of renown not forsaken, ¶ the city of my joy !' ** ²⁶ Therefore her young men shall fall in her broad places, and all the men of war shall be brought to silence in that day, saith Yahweh of hosts. ²⁷ And I will kindle a fire in the wall of Damascus, and it shall devour the palaces of Ben-hadad. ††

* Two cities, named together, as here, in Isa. 10. 9, 36. 19, 37. 13, and also mentioned frequently in the Ass. Inscriptions. Hamath was 110 miles N. of Damascus, and Arpad 95 miles N. of Hamath, and 10 miles N. of Aleppo.

† I.e. are rendered powerless through fear: cf. Ex. 15. 5, Josh. 2. 9, 24, Ps. 75. 3 (A.V., R.V. 'dissolved'); and Ez. 7. 17, 'all knees shall *run into water*.'

‡ So with slight changes (partly Symm. Vulg., partly LXX.). The Heb. text has, (there is) *care in (or by) the sea, it cannot rest*; which appears to yield no sense agreeable to the context, as there was no 'sea' at or near Damascus. חַסְדֵּי does not mean 'sorrow,' but 'care,' 'anxiety'; see Josh. 22. 24, and cf. the cognate verb in Jer. 17. 8. With the last clause, comp. Isa. 57. 20.

§ Lit. *hath sunk down slackly*, said usually of the hands (6. 24, 47. 3).

|| So with a very slight change in the punctuation (הַ for ה). The Heb. text has *she hath seized on trembling* (cf. Job 18. 20 R.V.m.).

¶ If the text is correct, this will be an example of an idiom common in German, but otherwise unknown in Heb., the meaning being (in English idiom) *How is the city of renown forsaken!* Duhm would remove the anomaly by reading *Woe to her!* (הֵי לָהּ for הֵי לָהּ) *the city of renown is forsaken*. However, the existing Heb. text, whatever its difficulties, is already attested by the LXX.

** This verse must be supplied to be spoken by one of the citizens of Damascus. Pesh. Targ. Aq. Symm. Theod. Vulg. (the reading of the LXX. cannot be determined), however, have *the city of joy* (מִשְׂרֵי for מִשְׂרֵי); cf. 'houses of joy' in Isa. 32. 13. If this be the true reading, the words will be the prophet's, and the inverted commas will of course disappear.

†† Varied from Am. 1. 4 and 14: cf. above, 21. 14b.

²⁸ On Kedar,* and on the kingdoms of Hazor,† which Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon smote.

Thus saith Yahweh: Arise ye, go up to Kedar, and spoil the children of the east. ²⁹ Their tents and their flocks shall they take; they shall carry away for themselves their curtains,‡ and all their vessels, and their camels: and they shall cry unto them, 'Terror on every side!' § ³⁰ Flee ye, wander far off, dwell deep,|| O ye inhabitants of Hazor, saith Yahweh; for Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon hath taken counsel against you, and hath conceived a purpose against you. ¶ ³¹ Arise,** get you up unto a nation that is in prosperity, that dwelleth without care,†† saith Yahweh, which have neither gates nor bars, which dwell alone.‡‡ ³² And their camels shall be a booty, and the multitude of their cattle a spoil: and I will scatter unto all winds them that have the corners (of their hair) clipt; §§ and from every side of them will I bring their calamity, saith Yahweh. ³³ And Hazor shall be a dwellingplace of

* A wealthy pastoral tribe (Isa. 60. 7), famous also as bowmen (Isa. 21. 17), living in villages (Isa. 42. 11) in the wilderness, somewhere on the E. or S.E. of Palestine (Jer. 2. 10; Isa. 21. 16 f.), often mentioned also in the Ass. Inscriptions.

† Or, *the village-settlements*. 'Hāzor' is probably a collective term, derived from *hāzār*, a 'village,' denoting Arab tribes living in fixed settlements or 'villages' (cf. Gen. 25. 16; Isa. 42. 11, 'the *villages* that *Kedar* doth inhabit'), as opposed to nomadic tribes. The Arab *ḥaqīr* is used similarly: see Lane, *Arab. Lex.* 590b, *Enc. Bibl.* ii. 1978.

‡ I.e. their tent-hangings (1. 20, 10. 20).

§ With this exclamation cf. 6. 25, 20. 3, 4, 10 (Ps. 31. 13), 46. 5.

|| See on v. 8.

¶ So the Versions, many MSS., and the Heb. margin. The Heb. text has *them*.

** Addressed to the *assailants* of Hazor (cf. v. 28b)

†† Lit. *confidently*. (When the confidence is well-grounded, rendered usually *in safety*, Lev. 25. 18, 19, *safely*, Jer. 23. 6, or *securely*, Ez. 28. 26: in Zeph. 2. 15, Isa. 47. 8, where, as here, it is ill-grounded, it is rendered *carelessly*.) Comp. Ez. 38. 11, which illustrates both this and the following clause.

‡‡ I.e. in seclusion, far from the liability of attack. For this sense of 'dwell alone,' see Deut. 33. 28, Ps. 4. 8 (R.V.m.).

§§ See on 9. 26.

jackals, a desolation for ever : no man shall dwell there, neither shall a son of man sojourn therein.

NOTES

XLVIII. 30. For לֹא כֵן 'not right,' cf. 23. 10, 2 Kings 7. 9, Prov. 15. 7; and of words or speaking, as here, Jer. 8. 6, 2 Kings 17. 9.

38. *Every one.* Or, more exactly, *the whole of it*, the suffix being neuter : see the same idiom in Isa. 1. 23, 15. 3, Ps. 29. 9, etc. (*Lex.* p. 481 d. b). 'Waiting' is (in the Heb.) a subst. : see G.-K. § 141c.

XLIX. 4. For רַב עֲמֻנָה זֶבַע Grätz conjectured cleverly רַב עֲמֻנָה; but 'the multitude of thy vales,' though excellent in itself, is somewhat tautologous after 'the vales.' It is quite possible, however, that the existing Hebrew text רַב עֲמֻנָה זֶבַע עֲמֻנָה is the corrupted result of a dittography (the LXX express only רַב עֲמֻנָה 'in the vales'; and that we should should read simply either *in thy vales*, or *in the multitude of thy vales*.

23b. The text, as it stands, cannot be correct; but the change adopted above seems the least that will yield a fairly satisfactory sense (כִּי מִדָּאָנָה for בִּיךָ דָּאָנָה, cf. Symm. ὑπὸ μερίμνης, Vulg. *prae sollicitudine*; and יִכְלוּ for יִכְלוּ, cf. the plural δύνωνται in LXX) The case is, however, one of those in which one cannot feel confident that the emendation proposed hits the original text. The LXX do not express 'like the sea,' but have simply two verbs, presupposing apparently, *they are full of care* (דָּאָנָה for דָּאָנָה), *they cannot rest*.

24. To render the existing Heb. text *trembling hath seized on her*, on the strength of the Massoretic peculiarity noticed in G.-K. § 91e, is artificial and precarious.

S. R. DRIVER.

STUDIES IN THE FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN.

IV.

THE FILIAL CHARACTER AND HOPE.

And now, little children, abide in Him;
 So that if He should be manifested, we may have confidence,
 And not shrink with shame from Him in His coming.
 If you know that He is righteous,
 You perceive that every one doing righteousness is begotten of Him.
 See what manner of love the Father has given to us,
 Purposing that we should be called children of God!
 —And so we are.

For this reason the world knows us not,
 Inasmuch as it knew not Him.

Beloved, we are now children of God;
 And it has not yet been manifested what we shall be!
 We know that if He should be manifested, we shall be like Him;
 Because we shall see Him as He is.
 And every one who has this hope set upon Him,
 Purifies himself according as He is pure.

—1 *John* ii. 28—iii. 3.

HAUPT¹ is right in attaching *vv.* 28 and 29 of the second chapter to the third, and in marking at this point a main division in the structure of the Epistle. “With the exception of *μένειν* at the beginning of the two verses,” he observes, “all the ideas in them are new and enter the Epistle for the first time”; and these “special ideas, touched here for the first time, are the ever recurring constitutive elements” of its second half. “*φανεροῦσθαι* is taken up again in iii. 2–5; *παρρησίαν ἔχειν* is elucidated in iii. 19–22, iv. 17 f., v. 13 ff.; *ποιεῖν τὴν δικαιοσύνην* forms the fundamental thought of the first ten verses of chap. iii.; *ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεγενῆσθαι* is not only repeated in *τέκνα Θεοῦ*, iii. 1 f., but also from iii. 24 onwards is more closely considered. The thought announced in ii. 28 is precisely in the same sense the theme of the

¹ See his *Commentary* (Eng. ed.), pp. 142 ff.

next part of the Letter, as i. 5 was of that which has just closed." The abrupt opening of iii. 1 suggested to the chapter-dividers the break they have made there; but one has only to read on into verses 2 and 3 to find that the writer's mind is following closely the vein struck at the close of the previous chapter; the thought of the Lord's approaching "manifestation," raising solicitude for the state and posture in which His people should then be found, holds him fast. The exclamatory ἴδετε of iii. 1 is the sign not of logical discontinuity, but of emotional disturbance. Striking for the first time in his Letter on the idea of the believer's *sonship* toward God (γεγεννήται ἐξ αὐτοῦ), the writer falls into astonishment at the love thus disclosed in God, at the fact that He should care to be our Father and should design to give us the name and status of children to Himself. But he quickly comes round again in the ἐὰν φανερωθῇ of verse 2 to the point of view assumed in ii. 28; the "hope" which is held out in verse 3, of "seeing Christ as He is" (v. 2), is at the same time the hope of standing before Him with "boldness in" that "coming" which the readers were led to expect in ii. 28.

The introductory words of address, "And now, little children" (cf. 2 John 5, Acts iii. 17, x. 5, xiii. 11, for καὶ νῦν as a rhetorical form of transition, continuative and resumptive; for τεκνία, introducing a fresh topic, cf. ii. 1, 12, iii. 7), call attention to the prospect rising before the writer's mind. With the watchword μένετε ἐν αὐτῷ St. John opens the new line of appeal, as he closed with it his former protestation, in the last words of verse 27. "Abiding in God" by retaining "the chrism" of the Spirit, who "teaches about all things" (v. 27), the readers will not be led astray by antichrists and false prophets appearing in this "last hour," who deny the Father and the Son and gainsay the word heard in the Church from the beginning (vv. 18-26). But more than that, by so abiding—by loyalty to the apostolic

message and to their own convictions of spiritual truth—they will prepare for Christ's coming and will be able to meet Him without fear or shame. They will thus assert their filial character, and realize the inconceivable blessedness of their inheritance as the children of God, whose glory is as yet unrevealed and who have in God's righteousness and in the purity of Jesus reproduced in themselves a pledge of the loftiest hopes. Such is the gist of the paragraph we are dealing with; and such appears to be its connexion with the foregoing context, to which it is linked not only by the double *μένετε ἐν αὐτῷ*, but also by the foreboding words *ἔσχατη ὥρα* of verse 18 and "the promise of eternal life" in verse 25, which lead the way to the *παρουσία* announced in verse 28.

At this point, however, it is possible to take a wider survey of the course of the Epistle. From i. 5 onwards to ii. 27 St. John has been working out and expanding on all sides the idea of fellowship with God and in God, realized through the message brought by Jesus Christ, under the conception of dwelling and walking "in the light." Over against the true light is set "the darkness" of sin, which combats it at every stage and under every form of contradiction and deceit—in the individual soul (i. 6–ii. 11), in the world (ii. 15–17), and in the Antichristian movement that has developed within the Church (ii. 18–27). But from this section onwards the *κοινωνία* of the soul and God takes on a more intimate character, a more vivid colouring and a warmer tone. We no longer read of "light" and "darkness," "the truth" and "the lie," of those who "walk in the light" or "the darkness," who are "of the truth" or "who lie and do not the truth," who profess truly or falsely to "have known God," but of "the children of God" and "of the Devil" respectively, of those who "have confidence toward God and do the things pleasing in His sight" or who "shrink away in shame before Him" and in "the fear that

has punishment," because they "are of God" or "are not of God" in either case. Where the ideas of the first half of the Epistle are called up again in the second half, as indeed we find them repeatedly, they reappear in a more concrete and personal form, with a livelier turn of expression and viewed in a more historical and experimental aspect. In the progress of the Epistle the general gives place to the particular, the metaphysical to the psychological; the doctrine heard from the beginning and the light shining evermore in the darkness are represented now as a "seed" of God's Spirit germinating amid the world's evil growths and overpowering them, as a holy love and will working mightily for salvation and winning their victory over hate and falsehood. This second half of the Epistle, like the first, sets out from the thought of the *φανερώσις* of Christ (cf. ἡ ζῶν ἐφανερώθη i. 2; and ἐὰν φανερωθῆ, ii. 28, iii. 2)—there His past, here His future manifestation; the first, that from which faith springs, the second, that to which hope looks; the first that which begins, the second that which completes the victory of God's light and love over human sin.

It may be observed that in this short course of *Studies*, which are not designed to cover the whole of the Epistle, we have leaped from verse 11 to 28 of the second chapter. Three sections are thus omitted: *vv.* 12–14, distinguishing, on the common basis of Christian experience, *Religion for the Old and for the Young*; *vv.* 15–17, warning the readers against *The Love of the World*; and *vv.* 18–27, an extended paragraph denouncing the antichrists who had arisen in *St. John's Last Hour* and guarding the Church from their seductions.¹ Important as these sections are and weighty in practical instruction, they are comparatively incidental and parenetic in scope, so that in passing from the earlier part of chapter ii. to its concluding verses we

¹ This section of the Epistle the writer expounded, under the title given, in the *EXPOSITOR* of an earlier date, Series V. v. pp. 241–255.

scarcely miss any chief topic of the Epistle or overlook any of its leading and determinative ideas, except indeed that of the *χρίσμα* in verses 20 and 27. This notion of the "chrism" (unction), which constitutes true *Christians* and is wanting to the *Antichrists* (see the Paper mentioned in the note below), supplies a conception of the Holy Spirit's office peculiar to St. John; and it gives to the above passage a unique significance and value. But for the rest, chap. ii. 12-27 serves mainly to apply in exhortation and polemic the substance of the Apostle's message as it has been declared in chap. i. 5 and onwards, and there would be little in the way of doctrine lost—however much would be lacking in point of illustration and application of the leading ideas—by proceeding at once from verse 11 to verse 28.

The stress of the sentence in verse 28 lies not on the imperative, *μένετε ἐν αὐτῷ*, which is carried over from verse 27, but on the reason therefor, *ἵνα ἐὰν φανερωθῇ παρρησίαν σχῶμεν κ.τ.λ.*: "Christ is to be manifested in His promised advent,—*when* we know not, but it may be soon; and we must appear before Him, with shame or confidence. Abiding in Him, you will be prepared whenever He may come. If the present should prove to be the world's last hour and the Lord should appear from heaven while we are yet on earth,¹ how welcome His appearing to those who love Him and are steadfastly obedient to His word! So the aged Apostle wistfully explores the future,—he of whom his Lord had said, "If I will that he tarry till I come!" (John xxi. 22). His *ἐὰν φανερωθῇ* echoes the *ἐὰν θέλω αὐτὸν μένειν ἕως ἔρχομαι* of the Lord's memorable saying about him. After those words of Jesus, the possibility of His coming within the Apostolic era and while John

¹ Cf. 1 Thess. iv. 15, 17, 1 Cor. xv. 51, for St. Paul's impression on the subject at a much earlier date, when he classed himself, provisionally, amongst the *περιλειπόμενοι εἰς τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ κυρίου*. But no such expression recurs in his later Epistles.

remained in the flesh was bound to be entertained; and the prolongation of the Apostle's life to the verge of human age might well encourage the hope of an early advent,—delayed indeed, but to be expected before the veteran Apostle's departure, and now therefore quite imminent.

That such an impression prevailed in the Church, in some minds amounting to a certain expectation, the reference in the appendix of St. John's Gospel indicates with tolerable plainness. The preceding paragraphs have brought the Apostle's readers to the verge of the Last Things. They see "the world passing away," the anti-christs arrived, portending the great Antichrist who was predicted to arise before Christ's return. Unbelief seems to have reached its limit, faith to have attained its full development in the teaching of the last surviving Apostle. It is a time of crisis, perhaps the closing hour of the Church's trials. "The Judge is at the door"; Christ stands waiting to return. At any moment the heavens may open and He "may be manifested," who is all the while so near us since the cloud received Him out of our sight, walking unseen amongst His Churches.¹ The conditions of the time have revived the prospect of the Lord's *φανέρωσις*, and bring it near to men's imagination. The Christian man, susceptible to these impressions, is compelled to ask himself, "What if my Lord should now appear? How should I meet Him if He came to-day? with joy or grief? with shame or rapture?" It is a test that, on many occasions, it becomes Christ's servants to put to themselves. Not for His first disciples alone did the Lord say, "Let your loins be girt about and your

¹ Cf. Rev. i. 12 ff., ii. 1; John i. 10, xiv. 18; Matt. xxviii. 20. It is noticeable that the Apostle John does not use *φανέρω*, as St. Paul used *ἀποκαλύπτω*, both of Christ's first and second coming; for he conceives the Eternal Word, the only Life and Light of men, as always present in creation and in humanity, but *manifested*—shining forth and made visible and cognizable—at these two great epochs.

lamps burning, and yourselves like unto men that look for their Lord, when He shall return from the wedding" (Luke xii. 35 ff.). If suddenly the clouds should part and the unseen Saviour and Judge stood revealed, if "the day of the Lord" should instantly break on the world "as a thief in the night," or if we should ourselves without further notice or preparation be summoned to His presence, amid the vast surprise could we then turn to Him a glad and eager face?

In this one instance St. John writes of the *παρουσία*, using the language of St. Paul, and builds on the anticipation of the definitive eventual return of the Lord Jesus. The fact that he does speak of it in this way, though but once, and that he lays this serious stress on the expectation, proves his agreement with the prevalent eschatology of the Church. The enigmatic saying of our Lord respecting John himself, with which his Gospel concludes (xxi. 22 f.), implies a literal "coming"; such words the subject of them would be the last man in the world to forget or to explain away; even supposing the Apostle were not the writer of the above chapter, it embodies a genuine Johannine tradition. This isolated allusion to the Parousia supplies a caution against inferences too readily drawn from the presence or absence of this expression or that in any particular writer, as to supposed differences of belief amongst the various schools of New Testament teaching. It has been argued that St. John conceived only of a spiritual coming of Christ and a moral and inward judgement effected by His word amongst men, so that the external Parousia and the great judgement-scene sketched in the Synoptic prophecies and in the preaching of St. Paul were transcended in his doctrine and became superfluous. This passage and the kindred saying of chap. iv. 17 f. show that St. John himself drew no such consequence from his principles, that he felt no contradiction between the

thought of Christ's spiritual presence and action upon mankind with the gradual process of sifting effected thereby, between this constant visiting and judging of the world on the one hand, and on the other hand that ultimate *φανέρωσις* and supreme *κρίσις* at the *συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος*, which dominates the New Testament horizon generally. Here the Apostle John contemplates the coming of the glorified Jesus to the world in judgement as explicitly and solemnly as does the Apostle Paul when he declares, "We must all be manifested before the judgement-seat of Christ" (2 Cor. v. 10). There is a difference, but it is that of emphasis and prevailing standpoint: St. John dwells on the process, St. Paul and others on the issue—he on the evolution, they on the *dénouement* of the great drama of Christ and the world. The Gospel of John, in contrast with the others, spends itself in working out the development of principles and character. He traces the catastrophe of our Lord's manifestation back to its antecedents eternal and temporal, showing how it was prepared for and contained in the moral forces operative in the world as these collided with the character and the purposes of God disclosed by the coming of His Son; the tremendous issue is, in many of its features, rather indicated and presupposed than drawn out in description. The *παρουσία* and the *ἡμέρα κυρίου* take in the theology of the Apostle John much the same relative position that the scenes of the Passion occupy in his Gospel narrative. They are held, so to speak, in solution throughout, and are presented in their latent preparations and preludings more than in their patent outcome and consummation.

Assuming then, in common with all who relied on the word of Jesus, His return as the King and Judge of mankind and entertaining the possibility of His near approach, the Apostle calls his readers to consider how they would face the Advent; they must desire to meet their Lord *with*

confidence of bearing (*παρησία*)¹ and without the shrinking of shame. If found, when the Lord comes, out of Christ instead of "abiding in Him"—suddenly confronted by the awful Presence which John saw in his Patmos visions, and standing before His tribunal—they must be overwhelmed with confusion and struck dumb with shame. The great "appearing," which should be the goal of Christian hope and satisfaction, brings to the unprepared inconceivable dismay. The admonition is brief as it is affecting, and stands almost alone in St. John's writings (see however iv. 17, 18); but it recalls the purport of our Lord's prophetic warnings given at length in the Synoptic discourses on the Last Judgement; and it echoes the frequent appeals of St. Paul to the same effect. In face of this august and heart-shaking event, such as must dash all self-complacency and trust in human judgement, what is St. John's confidence for himself and for his children? This appears in the sentences that follow, in verse 29 and verses 1 and 2 of chap. iii. The ground of it lies in the *filial consciousness*. This is the spring of Christian happiness and courage in view of death and judgement, and of the eternal issues of human destiny.

We cannot but note, at this place again, how completely St. Paul and St. John are at one and how

¹ Using the word *παρησία* (= *παν-ρήσις*, saying everything; then frankness of speech, unreservedness, publicity, confidence or courage of bearing), as also in iii. 21, iv. 17, v. 14, St. John might seem to be drawing again on the Pauline vocabulary; cf. 2 Cor. iii. 12, Eph. iii. 12, 1 Tim. iii. 13. The aorist *σχῶμεν* (not present, *ἔχωμεν*, as in the other places) after *ἵνα* seems to imply the *gaining* rather than the continued possession of courage, and points to the testing *occasion* of the Advent; "that we may take courage, and not be put to shame (*aorist*, *αἰσχυνθῶμεν*), shrinking from Him in His coming." Cf. for the aorist of *ἔχω*, Rom. i. 13, 2 Cor. i. 15, ii. 13, 2 Pet. ii. 16, where in each instance it signifies not a continued state of mind, but an *experience* associated with some particular occurrence. For the pregnant *ἀπό* (of separation) in this connexion, cf. i. 7, Rom. vi. 7, ix. 3, Col. ii. 20; and after *αἰσχύνομαι*, Isa. i. 29, Jer. ii. 36, xii. 13, Sir. xxi. 22, xli. 17 ff.

surely they came round, by their very different paths, to the same central points of experience and of theology. It is in the doctrine of the believer's "adoption" that St. Paul's exposition of the Christian salvation culminates in Romans viii. "If children, also heirs," is the argument that reassures him against all the counterforces and unknown possibilities of evil looming in the future. "Beloved, now we are children of God!" is the ground on which St. John stands in the same joyous certainty of a life eternal already won, that is rich as the love of God and sure as His sovereign will.

But the sonship in question, which is to supply the keynote of the Epistle from chap. iii. 1 onwards, is not affirmed at once; it is inferred in ii. 29 from the correspondence of character that links the Christian to his God. "If you know that He is righteous, you are aware that every one who does righteousness has been begotten of Him." *God*, and not Christ, is the subject of the assertion *δίκαιός ἐστιν*; for God is, in all consistency, the antecedent of *ἐξ αὐτοῦ* in the principal clause immediately following. Of "the Father" one "is begotten" (cf. iii. 1, 9 ff., iv. 4 ff., v. 1, 4, 18 f.): this goes so much without saying, that in passing from verse 28 to 29, having in his mind the final *γενένηται*, the great predication on which his thought is fixed, the writer makes the transition of subject unconsciously; he does not observe that the *αὐτοῦ* of the second sentence is referred, without explanation, to a person other than that denoted by the *αὐτοῦ* of verse 28 foregoing. For grammatical clearness, *ὁ Θεός* should have been expressed in verse 29. The righteousness of God (i. 9) and of Christ (ii. 1) is, however, so identical that the *δίκαιός ἐστιν* forms in itself a link of transition; the subjects appear to be undistinguished in the writer's mind; the idea of Christ melts into that of God. In Him God "is righteous," to our knowledge; the Divine righteousness is rendered into

human character, made imitable and communicative. But if *δίκαιός ἐστίν* does not, *γεγέννηται ἐξ αὐτοῦ* does involve distinction of Father and Son; one cannot extend the saying of Jesus, "I and the Father are one," to the point of making the former also the *begetter*; when believers are said to be "born of the Spirit," in John iii. 6, 8, *πνεῦμα* is opposed to *σάρξ* and *ἐκ πνεύματος γεννηθῆναι* is tantamount to *ἐκ Θεοῦ γεννηθῆναι* (John i. 13). *γεγέννηται* in this passage finds its interpretation immediately in the next verse: "Begotten of *Him*, I say; for look at *the Father's* love to us!"

1. The first ground of confidence on which the Apostle would have his little children rest—a ground derived from the vindication he has now made of the Christian character—lies in *the practice of righteousness*. This proves a Divine filiation in the Christian man: *ὁ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεγέννηται*. St. John seeks to encourage and calm his readers. The prospect of Christ's coming as Judge of mankind is fearful to the imagination. The descriptions of the Apocalypse clothed His person with an overwhelming majesty. The Apostle knows that his children are leading upright and worthy lives, and that most of them have no need for fear in this event. He bids them take courage, since they show by their daily walk that God's Spirit is in them and their "doing" is such as Christ must approve. Under similar terms—dwelling now on disposition, now on conduct—St. John has previously described filial life towards God; he holds up the same ideal throughout the Letter: he who "walks in the light" (i. 7), who "keeps God's commandments" and "His word" (ii. 3, 5), who "loves his brother" (ii. 10), who "does the will of God" (ii. 17), becomes now the man "who does (executes) righteousness," so approving himself, the Apostle shows in the sequel (iii. 7-9), as "begotten of God," in contrast with "the doer of sin" who is "of the devil." On the

same principle, in chap. v. 2, the one evidence of brotherhood that St. John will allow is that of "loving God and doing His commandments." *Doing* is the vital thing. Sentiments, high notions, pious talk, go for nothing unless they be put into performance. Not "word and tongue," but "deed and truth" are in requisition (iii. 18).

GEORGE G. FINDLAY.

(To be continued.)

THE LETTER TO THE CHURCH IN SARDIS.

(Continued.)

BUT Sardis was not entirely degenerate and unworthy. Even in it there were a few persons who maintained their Christian character and "did not defile their garments." This strong expression shows wherein lay the guilt of Sardis. It was different essentially from the fault of Thyatira, the city which comes next to Sardis in the severity of its condemnation. Thyatira was in many ways distinguished by excellence of conduct, and the corporate life of its Church was vigorous and improving, so that its "last works were more than the first"; but a false theory of life and a false conception of what was right action were leading it astray. Sardis was not Christian enough to entertain a heresy or be led astray by a false system; it had lost all vigour and life, and had sunk back to the ordinary pagan level of conduct, which from the Christian point of view was essentially vicious and immoral in principle.

The Sardian Church fell under the condemnation pronounced by St. Paul (1 Cor. v. 10) against those who, having become Christians and learned the principles of morality, relapsed into the vices which were commonly practised in pagan society. These were to be treated far more severely than the pagans, though the pagans lived after the same fashion; but the pagans lived so on principle, knowingly and intentionally, because they held it to be right, whereas the Christians had learned that it was wrong, and yet from weakness of will and character slipped back into the evil. With them the true Christians were

not to keep company, but were to put them out of their society and their meetings. With pagans who lived after the same fashion, however, it was allowable to associate (though it lies in the nature of the case, and needs no formal statement, that the association between Christians and pagans could never be so intimate as that of Christians with one another).

A peculiarly kind and loving tone is perceptible in this part of the letter. There is a certain reaction after the abhorrence and disgust with which the weak degeneracy of Sardis has been described; and in this reaction the deserts of the faithful few are painted with a loving touch. They have kept themselves pure and true, and "they shall walk with Me in white, for they are worthy." Their reward shall be to continue to the end white and pure, as they have kept themselves in Sardis.

This warm and affectionate tone is marked by the form of the final promise, which begins by simply repeating what has been already said in the letter. In most of the other letters the final promise comes as an addition; but here the love that speaks in the letter has already uttered the promise, and there is nothing left except to say it again, and to add explicitly what is already implied in it, life. "He that overcometh shall thus be arrayed in white garments; and I will in no wise blot his name out of the Book of Life, and I will confess his name before my Father and before his angels." The reward of all victors shall be the reward just promised to the few faithful in Sardis, purity and life—to have their name standing always in the Book, openly acknowledged and emblazoned before God.

In the Smyrnaean letter also the concluding promise is to a certain extent anticipated in the body of the letter, as here; and the tone of that letter is throughout warm and appreciative, beyond the rest of the Seven Letters. Where

this letter rises to the tone of love and admiration, it approximates to the character of the Smyrnaean letter, and like it ends with the promise of life.

The "Book of Life" is here evidently understood as an official list (so to say) of the citizens of the heavenly city, the true Jerusalem, the Elect City, peopled by the true Christians of all cities and provinces and nations. As in all Greek and Roman cities of that time, there was kept a list of citizens, according to their class or tribe or deme, in which new citizens were entered and from which degraded citizens were expunged, so the writer of this letter figuratively mentions the Book of Life. There is a remnant in Sardis whose names shall never be deleted from the Book, from which most Sardians have been expunged already.

That undoubtedly is the meaning which would be taken from the words here by Asian readers. Mr. Anderson Scott points out that in the Jewish Apocalyptic literature a wider sense is given to the term, and the "Book of Life" is regarded as a record of exploits, a history of the life and works of God's people. That this second sense was in the writer's mind elsewhere is certain; but it is clear from xx. 12 (compare xiii. 8, xvii. 8, xx. 15) that the books of record are distinct from the "Book of Life." The wider sense would not be gathered by the Asian readers from this reference, and was clearly not intended by the writer of the letter.

This is one of many points of difference which strongly mark off the Apocalypse of John from the common Apocalyptic literature of that age and earlier times; and this immense difference ought never to be forgotten (though it is perhaps not always remembered clearly enough) by those scholars who, in studying the great influence exerted by the older literature of this class on our Apocalypse, have seen in it an enlarged Christian edition of an originally Jewish Apocalypse.

White was widely considered among the ancient nations as the colour of innocence and purity. On this account it was appropriate for those who were engaged in the worship of the gods, for purity was prescribed as a condition of engaging in divine service, though usually the purity was understood in a merely ceremonial sense. All Roman citizens wore the pure white toga on holidays and at religious ceremonies, whether or not they wore it on ordinary days; in fact, the great majority of them did not ordinarily wear that heavy and cumbrous garment; and hence the city on festivals and holidays is called "*candida urbs*," the city in white. Especially on the day of a Triumph, white was the universal colour—though the soldiers, of course, wore not the toga, the garb of peace, but their full-dress military attire with all their decorations—and there can hardly be any doubt that the idea of walking in a Triumph similar to that celebrated by a victorious Roman general is here present in the mind of the writer when he uses the words, "they shall walk with me in white." A dirty and dark-coloured toga, on the other hand, was the appropriate dress of sorrow and of guilt. Hence it was worn by mourners and by persons accused of crimes.

The Asian readers could know of a Roman Triumph only from literature and report, for in the strictest sense Triumphs could be celebrated only in Rome, and only by an Emperor in person; but, in proportion as the Triumph in the strict old Roman sense became rare, the splendour and pomp which had been appropriated originally to it alone were more widely employed; as, for example, in the procession escorting the presiding magistrate, the Praetor, to the games in the Roman Circus; and there is no doubt that the great provincial festivals and shows which were celebrated in the chief Asian cities according to Imperial policy as a means of diffusing Roman ideas and ways, were inaugurated with a procession modelled after the stately

Roman procession in which the Praetor was escorted in triumph to the circus, as Juvenal describes it—

What! had he seen, in his triumphant car
Amid the dusty Cirque, conspicuous far,
The Praetor perched aloft, superbly drest
In Jove's proud tunic with a trailing vest
Of Tyrian tapestry, and o'er him spread
A crown too bulky for a human head:

Add now the Imperial Eagle, raised on high,
With golden beak, the mark of majesty,
Trumpets before, and on the left and right
A cavalcade of nobles, all in white.

Thus though the Triumph itself could never have been seen by the readers of this letter, they knew it, partly from report and literature as the most typical celebration of complete and final victory, partly from frequently seeing ceremonies in the great Imperial festivals which were modelled after the Triumph. Hence, St. Paul in writing to the Colossians, ii. 15, uses a similar metaphor: "he made a show of the principalities and the powers, openly triumphing over them in it," which (as Lightfoot and scholars generally recognize) means that the powers of the world were treated as a general treats his conquered foes, stripped¹ of their honours, and paraded in the Triumph as a show to please the citizens and to glorify the conqueror.

The Triumph was in origin a religious ceremonial. The victorious general who celebrated it played for the moment the part of the Roman god Jupiter; he wore the god's dress and insignia, and resigned them again when he reached the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline Mount. But it need not be thought strange that St. John and St. Paul should use this pagan ceremonial to express metaphorically the decisive triumph of Christ over all opposing powers in the world, when we have seen that Ignatius describes the life of the true Christian as

¹ The A V. must at this point be considered truer to the spirit of the passage than the Revised Version.

a long religious procession similar to those which were celebrated in the pagan ritual.

The warm and loving tone in the latter part of the Sardian letter need cause no wonder. There is always something peculiarly admirable and affecting in the contemplation of a pure and high life which maintains unspotted rectitude amid surrounding degradation and vileness. No characters stand out in clearer relief and more striking beauty than the small band of high-minded Romans who preserved their nobility of spirit and life amid the degeneracy and servility of the early Empire. The same distinction marks this remnant of purity amid the decaying and already dead Church of Sardis. Even the thought of it rouses a warm interest in the modern reader's mind, and we understand how it inspires this part of the letter with an unusual warmth of emotion, which contrasts with the coldness that we observed in the Ephesian letter.

Hence also we see how the analogy between these two letters, the Sardian and the Ephesian, ceases towards the end of the letter. The standard of conduct throughout the Ephesian Church had been uniform : the whole Church had acted correctly and admirably in the past ; the whole Church was cooling down and beginning to degenerate. No exception is made ; no remnant is described that had not lost heart and enthusiasm. The changeable nature of Ephesus had affected all alike. And therefore the penalty is pronounced, that the Church shall be moved out of its place. It is a conditional penalty ; but there is no suggestion that any portion of the Church has escaped or may escape it. The Church as a whole must revivify itself, or suffer the penalty ; and Ephesus cannot alter its nature ; changeableness is the law of its being. There is no real hope held out that the penalty may be avoided ; and the promise at the conclusion is couched in the most general terms ; this Church is cooling and degenerating, but to him that overcometh vigour and life shall be given.

On the other hand, the Sardian Church has not been uniform in its conduct, and it shall not all suffer the same fate. The Church as a whole is dead; but a few, who form bright and inspiring exceptions, shall live as citizens of the heavenly city. There is no hint that Sardis shall be spared, or the Church survive it. Its doom is sealed irrevocably; and yet a remnant shall live.

Sardis to-day is a wilderness of ruins and thorns, pastures and wildflowers, where the only habitations are a few huts of Yuruk nomads beside the Temple of Cybele in the low ground by the Pactolus, and at the distance of a mile two modern houses by the railway station. And yet in a sense a remnant has escaped and still survives, which does not indeed excite the same loving tenderness as makes itself felt in the latter part of this letter, yet assuredly merits our sympathy and interest. In the plain of the Hermus, which Sardis once dominated, there are a few scattered villages whose inhabitants, though nominally Mohammedans, are clearly marked off by certain customs from the Turkish population around. Their women (according to the account given us at Sardis) usually bear Christian names, though the men's names are of the ordinary Mohammedan class; they have a kind of priests, who wear black head-dress, not the white turban of the Mohammedan hodjas and imams; the villages hold private assemblies when these "black-heads" (Kara-Bash) pay them visits; they drink wine and violate other Mohammedan rules and prohibitions; and it is believed by some persons who have mixed with them that they would become Christians forthwith, if it did not mean death to do so. At the same time they are not at all like the Takhtaji (described in *Impressions of Turkey*, p. 268, and elsewhere); the latter are apparently a survival of ancient paganism, pre-Christian in origin.

W. M. RAMSAY.

CHARACTERISTICS OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK.

VII.

WE pass on to the Pronominal Adjectives and Numerals. The use of εἰς as an ordinal is "undoubtedly a Hebrew idiom" (Blass, p. 144). By this time I am afraid I shall be regarded as a hopeless "Purist"—if a Purist could be imagined taking under his wing the post-classical Greek—but even at this risk I must express my doubts here. Blass is, of course, right in saying that the Attic εἰς καὶ εἰκοστός, like *unus et vicesimus* or our *one and twentieth*, is essentially different. But what of τῇ μιᾷ καὶ εἰκάδι (in a Berlin papyrus of 2nd or 3rd century)? We have many examples of ἐνάτῃ καὶ εἰκάδι and the like, but in this example there is no ordinal in the whole phrase.¹ If Hebrew usage caused this, why was it restricted to the first numeral? Regarded as vernacular Greek, the reason of the restriction is obvious: πρῶτος is the only ordinal which in form altogether differs from the cardinal.² As Winer remarks, we ourselves use cardinal for ordinal in phrases like *page forty*.

There is a further use of εἰς which calls for remark, its development into an indefinite article, like *ein* in German, *un* in French, or our own *an*. The fact that εἰς progressively ousted τις in popular speech, and that even in classical Greek there was a use which only needed a little

¹ εἰκάς, like τριάς, δεκάς, τριακάς, etc., was originally either "the number 20" or "a set of 20," though used only for the 20th of the month. Cf. τριάς in Philo="3rd day" (L. & S.).

² δεύτερος is not derived from δύο, but popular etymology would naturally connect it. In Byzantine Greek the cardinals beyond 4 began to take the place of the ordinals, which they have now entirely ousted: see Dieterich, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 187 f.

diluting to make it essentially the same,¹ is surely enough to prove that the development was entirely within the Greek language, and owed no more to Hebrew than it did to popular Latin. We cannot, I fear, listen to Meyer (on Matt. viii. 19), denying that εἰς is ever used in the New Testament in the sense of τις: to import subtleties into the meaning, against the development history of the common Greek, is a risky procedure. The use of ὁ εἰς in Mark xiv. 10 is, as noted in EXPOSITOR VI. vii. 111, paralleled in early papyri. In Blass's second edition we find a virtual surrender of the Hebraism in δύο δύο, συμπόσια συμπόσια, δεσμός δεσμός (a highly probable reading in Matt. xiii. 30): he remarks on μίαν μίαν in Sophocles that "Atticists had evidently complained of it as vulgar, and it was not only Jewish Greek." It might be said that Jewish Greek has no more to do with it than English has. The note in Thumb's *Hellenismus* (p. 128) gives modern Greek parallels, and Deissmann (*Theol. Literaturz.* 1898, p. 631) cites τρία τρία from a third century papyrus. Thumb is undeniably right in calling the coincidence with Hebrew a mere accident.

Two single passages claim a word before we pass on from the numerals. Ὀγδοον Νῶε ἐφύλαξεν in 2 Peter ii. 5 presents us with a classical idiom which can be shown to survive at any rate in literary Common Greek: see examples in Winer, p. 312, and in Schaefer's Demosthenes *l.c.* I have not noticed any occurrences in the papyri, and in 2 Peter we rather expect bookish phrases. The A.V. of this passage is an instructive illustration for our inquiries as to Hebraisms. "Noah the eighth person" is not English, for all its appearing in a work which we are taught to regard as the impeccable standard of classic purity. It is a

¹ It is difficult to see any difference between εἰς and τις in Aristophanes, *Av.* 1292:—

πέρδιξ μὲν εἰς κάπηλος ὠνομάζετο
χωλός, Μενίππῳ δ' ἦν χελιδῶν τοῦνομα, κ.τ.λ.

piece of "translation English," and fairly unintelligible too, one may well suppose, to a great many of its less educated readers. Now if this specimen of Homeric nodding had made its way into the language—like the misprint "strain *at* a gnat"—we should have had a fair parallel for "Hebraism" as hitherto understood. As it stands, a phrase which no one has ever thought of imitating, it serves to illustrate the over-literal translations which appear very frequently in the LXX. and in the New Testament, where a Semitic original underlies the Greek text.

Last in this division comes a note on Matthew xviii. 22. Blass ignores entirely the rendering "seventy-seven times" (R.V. margin), in spite of the fact that this meaning is unmistakable in Genesis iv. 24 (LXX.). It will surely be felt that Dr. Moulton (note on Winer, p. 314) was right in regarding that passage as decisive. A definite *allusion* to the Genesis story is highly probable: Jesus pointedly sets against the natural man's craving for seventy-sevenfold revenge the spiritual man's ambition to exercise the privilege of seventy-sevenfold forgiveness. For a partial grammatical parallel I might quote *Iliad* xxii. 349, δεκάκις [τε] καὶ εἴκοσι, "tenfold and twenty-fold," if the passage is sound.

We pass on to the Article, on which there is not very much to say, since in all essentials its use is in agreement with Attic. It might indeed be asserted that the New Testament is in this respect remarkably "correct" when compared with the papyri. It shows no trace of the use of the article as a relative, which is found in classical Greek outside Attic, in the later papyri,¹ and to some extent in Modern Greek. The papyri likewise exhibit some examples of the article as demonstrative, apart from connexion with μέν or δέ,¹ whereas the New Testament has nothing beyond the poetical quotation in Acts xvii. 28. Further, we have nothing answering to the vernacular idiom by

¹ See Völker, *Der Artikel*, pp. 5, 6 (*Syntax d. gr. Papyri*, I.).

which the article may be omitted in the articular infinitive. In family or business accounts among the papyri we find with significant frequency an item of so much *εἰς πείν*, with the dative of the persons for whom this thoughtful provision is made. There are three passages in Herodotus where *ἀντί* behaves thus: see vi. 32, *ἀντί εἶναι*, with Strachan's note, and Goodwin, *M.T.* § 803. In these three points we may possibly recognize Ionic influence showing itself in a limited part of the vernacular; it is at least noteworthy that Herodotus will supply parallels for them all. The Ionic elements in the *Κοινή* were briefly alluded to above (EXPOSITOR, April, p. 318), where other evidence may be noted for the sporadic character of these elements, and their tendency to enlarge their borders in the later development of the Common Greek.

We are not much troubled with Hebraism under the article. Blass (p. 151) regards as "thoroughly Hebraic" such phrases as *πρὸ προσώπου Κυρίου, ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς: κατ' οἶκον αὐτῶν*, however, "is a regular phrase and perhaps not a Hebraism." Where Semitic originals are clearly behind our Greek, there need be little objection; but the mere admission that *κατ' οἶκον αὐτῶν* is Greek shows how slightly these phrases diverge from the spirit of the translator's language. Phrases like *τοὺς ἐν οἴκῳ, διὰ χειρὸς ἐξ οἴκου*, etc., are recurrent in the papyri, and the extension, such as it is, lies in the addition of a dependent genitive. The principle of "correlation" (on which see the note in Winer-Moulton, p. 175) here supports the strong tendency to drop the article after a preposition. This is seen working in the papyri: cf. Völker, *op. cit.* pp. 15-17. Without laying down a law that the noun is naturally anarthrous when attached to a preposition, we may certainly say that the usage is so predominant that no refinements of interpretation are justifiable. Obviously *ἐν οἴκῳ* (Mark ii. 1) is not "in a house," nor *ἐν ἀγορᾷ* (Luke vii. 32)

“in a market-place,” nor ἐν ἀγορᾷ, in the current papyrus formula, “in a street.” We say “down town,” “on ’Change,” “in bed,” “from start to finish.” If we substitute “in my bed,” “from the beginning to the end,” we are, I take it, more pictorial; we point, as it were, to the objects in question. There is nothing *indefinite* about the anarthrous noun there; but for some reason the qualitative aspect of a noun, rather than the deictic, is appropriate to a prepositional phrase, unless we have special reason to point to it the finger of emphatic particularity. As far as I can see, there is much the same nuance in Greek, where, however, the anarthrous use with prepositions is much more predominant than in English. Pursuing further the classes of words in which we insert *the* in translation, we have the anarthrous use “in sentences having the nature of headings” (Hort on 1 Peter, p. 15*b*). Hort assigns to this cause the dropped articles before θεοῦ, πνεύματος and αἵματος in 1 Peter i. 2; Winer cites the opening words of Matthew, Mark, and Revelation. The lists of words which specially affect a dropped article will, of course, need careful examination for the individual cases. Thus when Winer includes πατήρ in his list, and quotes John i. 14 and Hebrews xii. 7, we must feel that in both passages the qualitative force is very apparent—“what son is there whom his father, *as a father*, does not chasten?” (On the former passage see R.V. margin, and the note in Winer-Moulton, p. 151.) For exegesis there are few of the finer points of Greek which need more constant attention than this omission of the article in order to lay stress on the quality or character of the object. Even the R.V. misses this badly sometimes, as in John vi. 68.¹

With proper names we are not much nearer than we

¹ The marginal reading stood in the text in the First Revision. It is one among very many places where a conservative minority damaged the work by the operation of the two-thirds rule.

were to a satisfactory account of the shade of meaning conveyed by the article. Deissmann has attempted to define the papyrus usage in the Berlin *Philolog. Wochenschrift*, 1902, p. 1467. He shows how the classical use is still followed in the repetition with article of a proper name which on its first introduction was anarthrous. When a man's father's or mother's name is appended in the genitive it is normally with the article. There are very many cases where irregularities occur for which we have no explanation. See also Völker, p. 9, who notes the curious fact that the names of slaves and animals receive the article when mentioned the first time, where personalities that counted are named without the article. The innumerable papyrus parallels to *Σαῦλος ὁ καὶ Παῦλος* may just be alluded to before we pass from this subject: see Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, 313 ff.

The position of the article is naturally much affected by the colloquial character of the language. In written style the ambiguous position of *εἰς τὸν θάνατον*, Rom. vi. 4, would have been cleared up by the insertion of *τοῦ*, if the meaning was "by this baptism into his death." Generally speaking there is no doubt whether the prepositional phrase belongs to the neighbouring noun. A very curious misplacement of the article occurs in the *ὁ ὄχλος πολὺς* of John xii. 9. As Jebb notes on Sophocles, *O.T.* 1199 f., the noun and adjective may be fused as a composite idea; but Jebb's examples (like 1 Pet. i. 18 and the cases cited in Dr. Moulton's note WM. p. 166) apply only to the adding of a *second* adjective after the group article-adjective-noun (cf. *Ox. Pap.* 99, *τῆς ὑπαρχούσης αὐτῆ μητρικῆς οἰκίας τριστέγου*). I cannot discuss here the problem of Titus ii. 13, for we must as grammarians leave the matter open: see WM. 162, 156 note. But I might add to the Christian commentaries upon the passage the Berlin papyri 366, 367, 368, 371, 395, which give seventh century

attestation for the translation "our great God and Saviour." The formula runs *ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου καὶ δεσπότου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, καὶ τῆς δεσποίνης ἡμῶν τῆς ἁγίας θεοτόκου, κ.τ.λ.* Needless to say, these documents are just as valuable for the exegesis of this passage as they are for proving the deity of Mary, but it may be worth while to cite them. A curious echo is found in the Ptolemaic formula applied to the deified kings: thus Grenfell-Hunt, II. 15 (139 B.C.), *τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ εὐεργέτου καὶ σωτῆρος [ἐπιφανοῦς] εὐχαρίστου.* The phrase here is, of course, applied to one person.¹

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

¹ I find I cited this in my first paper (EXPOSITOR, vi. iii. 279).

STUDIES IN THE FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN.

IV.

THE FILIAL CHARACTER AND HOPE (*continued*).

THAT God "is righteous," dealing justly and fairly by all His creatures, in all His relations with them and responsibilities to them, is an axiom of revelation (see in particular Ps. xi. 7, cxvi. 5, clxv. 17, Isa. lix. 17, John xvii. 25, Rom. i. 17, iii. 26, 1 John i. 9, Rev. xvi. 5). The principle is laid down hypothetically (*ἐὰν εἰδῆτε*) for the sake of the consequence to be deduced from it (*γινώσκετε, κ.τ.λ.*), and not because of any real doubt (cf. iv. 12, John xiv. 15, for the form of expression), though indeed our knowledge of the surest certainties of Divine truth is subjectively contingent and faith has its varying moods, its clouds upon the sunniest sky. From this axiom the consequence follows, which the readers are bound to recognize, that "every man of righteous life is God's offspring." In this argumentative form of statement *γινώσκετε* is better read in the indicative than the imperative (the difference is practically very slight); the Apostle is making explicit what is already implicit in his children's knowledge of God and of themselves.¹

Not only is God righteous, but He alone is righteous, originally and absolutely. "None is good save One," said Jesus, "that is God" (Luke xviii. 19). Human excellence in every instance is dependent and derivative—to use St. John's language, it is "begotten of God." What is said of "goodness," is equally true of "righteousness"; while unrighteousness (*ἀδικία*, i. 9) is the characteristic of human-

¹ *γινώσκετε* in the apodosis—the verb proper to truth of *acquisition* (cf. *v. v.* 5, 18, iii. 19, 24, iv. 6); *εἰδῆτε* (*οἶδα*) in the protasis, indicating a truth of *intuition*, a matter of established conviction, belonging to one's realized stock of knowledge (cf. *v.* 20 f., *v.* 13, 18 ff.).

ity apart from God, for "the whole world lieth in the wicked one" (v. 19). God is the source of all right-being and right-doing. Apart from the Father of Jesus Christ there is no righteousness in any child of man. It follows that the presence of a living, operative righteousness is the sign of a Divine sonship, of that abiding filial spirit which breeds heart-peace and guarantees final victory. "Other tests of adoption are offered in the Epistle: 'love' (iv. 7) and belief that 'Jesus is the Christ' (v. 1). Each one, it will be found, includes the others" (Westcott *ad loc.*).

May we take this reasoning of St. John's in the full breadth of its application? Can we say that every righteous man is born of God—even if he be palpably heterodox, if he be an unbeliever, or a heathen? We are bound to do so. But we must understand "righteousness" and "unbelief" in the strict Christian sense: *ὁ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην* (not *δικαιοσύνην*). St. John intends by "*the* righteousness" that which deserves the name and has the genuine stuff in it, which "exceeds the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees" (Matt. v. 20) and differs in its intrinsic quality and flavour from all morality of that stamp. This means doing right by God Himself, first of all. When St. Paul speaks of "Gentiles which have not the law, doing by nature the things of the law," "showing the work of the law written in their hearts," of "the uncircumcision keeping the righteous demands of the law" and being so "accounted for circumcision," when he describes a type of man who is "a Jew in secret" and has a "circumcision of spirit" that is "in heart, not in letter," and "whose praise is not of men but of God" (Rom. ii. 14 f., 26-29), we cordially admit the existence of a righteousness availing before God that we cannot label or authenticate, that extends beyond the pale of orthodoxy, that does not take the form of creed-subscription nor reveal itself to any of the stated and necessary tests of religious com-

munion. There are moral paradoxes in the connexion between faith and practice—cases of men who rise quite above their admitted and conscious creed—that are baffling to our shallow and partial knowledge, secrets of the heart inscrutable except to its Maker; their solution stands over to the Judgement-day. Certain we may be of this, that whatever righteousness shows itself in any man comes from God his Father, whether the channel of its derivation be traceable or not; that whatever light shines in a human soul radiates from “the true light that lighteth every man,” whether the recipient knows the Sun of righteousness that has risen upon him or the clouds conceal its form.

2. Behind the first encouragement lies a second. If the Christian believer’s right-doing evidences God’s paternal relation to him and interest in him, this proves again *God’s fatherly love* bestowed upon the man. Over this the Apostle—here alone in his Letter—breaks into exclamation; argument gives place to wonder. “Look,¹ what a love the Father hath given to us!” The soul’s rock of assurance is God’s manifested love. If the final crash should come, if the ground should crumble beneath our feet and the graves open and heaven and earth pass away like a scroll that is rolled together,—amid that dread shattering convulsion, to which our Lord’s prophecies and John’s Apocalypse led the Church to look forward and which a moment ago (ii. 28) was called up to the reader’s imagination, the heart finds refuge and strength here; this anchor of the soul holds through the wreck of nature. St. John’s saying is St. Paul’s in other words: “Hope maketh not ashamed, because *the love of God* hath been poured out in our hearts” (Rom. v. 5); or again, “I am persuaded

¹ He uses *ὄρατε*, however, the proper imperative governing an accusative object—not the intrjectional *ὀδοῦ* or *ὀδέ*, the latter of which is common in St. John’s Gospel. He wishes his readers actually to “see” what they had not adequately realized; cf. Rom. xi. 22.

that neither death nor life . . . nor things present nor things to come . . . will be able to separate us from *the love of God* that is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

The sense and emphasis of the words demand a pause at the end of verse 1*a*, after *ὁ πατήρ* and before the continuing *ἵνα*. Let the readers for a moment contemplate, as it stands alone in its own wonder and glory, "the love that the Father has given" them! The clause that follows is not one of definition or explanation—as though God's love consisted in giving us the name of children. *How* God loves men—to what length and in what fashion—will be shown later; and the *ποταπή ἀγάπή* finds its exegesis in chap. iv. 9–14: the incarnation and the atonement of God's Son expound the sentence, "God is love." Here we ponder the bare fact, put in the briefest words and brought home to experience¹—God's bestowed and all-inclusive gift of His fatherly love in Jesus Christ.

The love of God, lodged in the heart and bearing fruit in a righteous life that mirrors His own righteousness (ii. 29), tends toward a certain mark for those who possess it: *ἵνα τέκνα Θεοῦ κληθῶμεν*. Unless we are to rob *ἵνα* of its purposive force, this clause imports a vocation still to be realized, an intention on God's part, *the aim of His love*,² reaching beyond actual experience. He has *given* His love; but that love means more than it can now give: *ἵνα κληθῶμεν* must be read in the light of the *παρουσία* (ii. 28), and by contrast with the *καὶ ἐσμεν* (of the true text) immediately interjected, and the *νῦν τέκνα Θεοῦ ἐσμεν* of verse 2. "We are children of God"—the Father's love has made us actually such already; we are to be *called* so³—pro-

¹ *δέδωκεν*, "hath given us," the perfect of abiding result; cf., for the tense, and for the experimental bearing of *δίδωμι*, iv. 13, v. 20; also the perfects in i. 1 f., iv. 14.

² Cf. Eph. i. 4, 5: *ἐν ἀγάπῃ προορίσας κ.τ.λ.*, "having in love foreordained us unto filial adoption to Himself"

³ *καλέω* implies beyond the mere *naming* or *designating*, an *entitling*,

nounced and acknowledged as His sons and on this title summoned to the heritage. *ἐὰν φανερωθῆ* and *ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ* (ii. 28, iii. 2) are the tacit adjuncts of *τέκνα κληθῶμεν*. This declaration is identical with what St. Paul describes as "the revelation of the sons of God," the event for which creation waits with strained expectancy (Rom. viii. 19), the occasion when the Son of man, according to His own words, "will say to those on His right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world" (Matt. xxv. 34). These are they whom the Son of God will not be ashamed to own as brethren, "when He comes in the glory of His Father with the holy angels" (Mark viii. 38); this owning of the sons of God by Christ and the Father before the universe admits them to the full rank and rights of children; it is the goal to which all the bestowments of the Father's love look onward.

That we shall be called "children of God," being addressed as such and invited to the children's place in His house, is a hope that "maketh not ashamed." "Boldness," indeed, will be theirs in the dread day who hear the Judge pronounce, "Come, ye blessed ones of my Father!" That sentence, however, will but declare the fact which already holds good. The words *καί ἔσμεν*, abruptly thrown out, correct the false implication that might be drawn from the previous clause, as though the Divine sonship of Christians would be constituted at the *παρουσία*, by the future pronouncement of Christ the Judge. When the true bearing of *ἵνα κληθῶμεν* was lost and it was referred, as by nearly all interpreters, to the present adoption of the saints (to the *νόθεσσία* of Galatians iv. 5 instead of that of Romans viii. 23), the eager assertion

instating. St. John uses the verb here only in his Epp. and rarely in the Gospel (but see Rev. xix. 9). For this pregnant sense of *καλέω*, cf. Matt. v. 9, *υἱοὶ Θεοῦ κληθήσονται* (parallel to *τὸν Θεὸν ὄψονται*, v. 8, and to *αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τ. οὐρανῶν*, v. 10), xxii. 45, Luke i. 35, John i. 42, Rom. ix. 25 f., Heb. ii. 11, James ii. 23; similarly *λέγω . . . φίλους* in John xv. 15. With St. Paul the *κλήσις* is already past.

“and (such) we are” naturally dropped from the text; it appeared otiose and superfluous. But with St. John’s *κλήσις* rightly understood, this *καί ἐσμεν* of the present fact stands out in relief against the purpose of future acknowledgement and investiture. What we shall then be *called*, already *we are*. “These are my sons,” God will say of His pilgrims coming home; they are His sons already in exile and obscurity.

“For this reason,”¹ the Apostle remarks, “the world knows us not.” The sons of God are at present under a veil, and their “life is hid” (Rom. viii. 19, Col. iii. 3); things are not seen in the true light, nor called by their right names. How should the world recognize us—“it did not know Him!” *God* was unknown to men—to the wisest and deepest in research (1 Cor. i. 21)—and this was proved to the world’s utter shame by its treatment of Him in whom God was: “Ye know,” Jesus said, “neither me nor my Father” (John viii. 19). “The rulers of this world,—none of them knew the Lord of glory” (1 Cor. ii. 8) beneath the servant’s garb; they had no eye for character, for the moral beauty and dignity of Jesus, for the Godhead in Him. For the same reasons the world ignored or despised His companions; they treated His Apostles, God’s messengers to them, as “the filth of the world and the off-scouring of all things.” The more Christians were like Christ and were conformed to the image of God’s Son, the less the world appreciated them. They must not be surprised at this nor take the world’s scoffs amiss. Nay, they should “rejoice and be exceeding glad,” counting this contempt their beatitude (Matt. v. 11 f.) and a pledge that as they suffer with their Lord they shall share His glory. Thus the whole of verse 1 goes to sustain the confidence of St. John’s little children, who shrank needlessly from the thought of Christ’s near and sudden advent.

¹ διὰ τοῦτο, as regularly with St. John, rests upon the foregoing context, and finds its confirmation and further explanation in the following *ὅτι* clause: cf. John v. 18, viii. 47, xii. 18, 39.

3. The assurance which the Apostle gives his readers is carried to its height, and their fears receive a full reproof, in the words of verse 2. Crowning *the active righteousness* of sons of God and their *conscious experience of the Father's love*, they have, springing out of all this, *the hope of sharing the Redeemer's state of glory*: "We know that, if He should be manifested, we shall be like Him." This central clause of verse 2 is its vital statement. The first two clauses resume and interpret verse 1: "Beloved, we are now God's children, and it has not yet been manifested what we shall be"—we are children away from home, wearing other names and the garb of exiles, awaiting our "manifestation" as the Son of God awaits His; our "call" to the filial estate, our full "adoption" and enfeoffment, is matter of promise, not of attainment; it is a "hope not seen" (Rom. viii. 24). But it is a sure hope—"we know" (*οἶδαμεν*) that it will come about, as we "know the love that God hath toward us" (iv. 16) and the fidelity of His promises (ii. 25); our guarantee is in the character of God, whom "the world knew not," but "ye know Him," said Jesus to His disciples, "and have seen Him" (John xiv. 7; cf. ii. 13 f. above).

While the subject of *οὐπω ἐφανερώθη* is given in the following clause (*τί ἐσόμεθα*), *ἐὰν φανερωθῆ* is pointedly resumed from ii. 28, the verse in which this train of thought took its commencement. "If He should be manifested"—the hidden but ever present Son of God, the Judge of men—we shall not view Him with guilty dread; nay, "we shall be like Him!"¹ The awkwardness of referring, within the compass of seven words, the all but identical forms of *φανερόμαι* to distinct subjects is relieved by the consideration that the two subjects are closely kindred and identified in the writer's thought: "What we shall be" and what He is—the glory of the redeemed and the Redeemer—are one in nature and coincident in manifestation, since "we

¹ We note the unconscious transition back again from *God* to *Christ*, made in verse 2b, the reverse of that which took place in ii. 28, 29.

shall be like to Him" (cf. 2 Thess. ii. 14, 1 Cor. xv. 48 f., Col. iii. 4, Phil. iii. 21).

This future likeness of Christians to Christ, along with their future call to the state and place of God's sons, is for the present a mystery; it involves an unimaginable change in the conditions of human existence (1 Cor. xv. 51). "Not yet was it manifested what we shall be." St. John speaks in the past tense (*ἐφανερώθη*), referring to the great historical manifestation of "the life," which he has summed up at the beginning of his Letter (i. 1 ff.), the revelation of the Son of God made flesh. But through all this great disclosure the life of the hereafter remained under the veil; many wondrous secrets of God were made plain, but not this. The form of Christ's risen body, and His appearances in glory to the dying Stephen, to Saul of Tarsus, and to John himself in the Apocalypse, might give hints and prompt speculations touching the conditions of the glorified state and its mode of being; but they supplied no more. One thing "we know"—surely it is enough: "We shall be *like Him*." This is one of the certainties of Christian faith.

Profoundly ignorant as we are of the future state, how much we know if we are sure of this! Such final resemblance of Christians to their Lord appears to be involved in the Incarnation and in our Lord's chosen title "Son of man,"—in the fact that He was "made in all things like to His brethren" (Heb. ii. 17). He has embarked Himself with humanity, identified Himself heartily and abidingly with our lot, so that what was ours became His, and what is His becomes ours. If He has left His brethren, it is, He said, "to prepare a place" for them, that they may be where He is. He has gone to the Father not by way of separating Himself from our low estate, but entering "the place within the veil" as "a forerunner on our behalf" (Heb. vi. 20). He was raised from the dead as "the first-begotten" and "firstfruit of them that fell asleep," the "firstborn of many brethren," who will be assimilated to His external, as they

are already to His internal and spiritual character, and will put off "the body of humiliation" for a celestial frame, *σῶμα πνευματικόν* and *ἐπουράνιον*, "of the same form with His body of glory" (1 Cor. xv. 20-57, Rom. viii. 29 f., Col. i. 18, Phil. iii. 20 f.). St. Paul's teaching upon the mystery of the heavenly life of the saints explains this allusion of St. John's; it gives substance and content to the *ὁμοιότης* anticipated here, which cannot be a merely interior and moral affinity; for that, as St. John insists, is now attained, or attainable, and "as He is"—in respect of love and righteousness—"so we are in this world" (vv. 3, 22, 24, iv. 17, 19, v. 18). *νῦν τέκνα Θεοῦ ἐσμεν*—that is one thing; *τί ἐσόμεθα* is something more and distinct from this.

The nature of the hidden *ὁμοιότης* is indicated by the reason given for expecting it, in the last clause of verse 2: "because we shall see Him as He is." The *αὐτῷ* of verse 2*b* and the *αὐτόν* of verse 2*c* must be *Christ*, who has been reintroduced by *ἐὰν φανερωθῇ*, and not God whom "none hath beheld at any time" (iv. 12; cf. John i. 18, 1 Tim. vi. 16, etc.). *Vision* and *manifestation* are correlatives; "if" and when the Lord Jesus "is manifested," His saints "will see Him as He is." But for vision there must be correspondence—new organs for a new revelation, eyes to behold the supernal light of the Advent day. Like sees like; so "the pure in heart shall see God" (Matt. v. 8). This is St. John's reasoning: Christ is to be manifested, His disciples, as He prayed and promised (John xvii. 5, 24, xii. 26, xiii. 31-xiv. 3), are to behold the glory which the Father has given Him and which was His eternally; but to be capable of this they must be transformed into a state as yet undisclosed and endowed with powers like His own, with faculties of apprehension incomparably higher than those we now possess. "Then shall I see face to face" (*τότε πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον*, 1 Cor. xiii. 12), says St. Paul; but that implies face matching face, eye meeting eye. The transient foretaste of our Lord's celestial glory which the three disciples

(John amongst them) enjoyed with Him in the Holy Mount, was overpowering to their natural senses ; and if the vision prefacing the Book of Revelation was a veritable experience of the writer, he was well convinced that one must pass into a very different mode of being if one is to realize the present glory of Jesus Christ and to bear the weight of His manifestation. Accordingly St. Paul, in his sketches of the *παρουσία* in 1 Thess. iv. 16 f. and 1 Cor. xv. 50 ff. and 2 Cor. v. 1-3, implies that a supernatural change, simultaneous with the raising of the dead, will supervene upon the living saints to prepare them to meet their Lord. There is nothing that gives the Christian so exalted and entrancing a conception of the future blessedness certified here, as the thought of being in the Saviour's company, admitted to the sight of His face and taking part in His heavenly and eternal service. Such approximation presupposes an environment, and powers of being, incalculably enlarged and ennobled. "In treating of this final transfiguration the Greek Fathers did not scruple to speak of men as being 'deified' (*θεοποιεῖσθαι*), though the phrase sounds strange to our ears" (Athanasius, *de Incarn. Verbi*, iv. 22, cited by Westcott). As the Son of God humbled Himself to share our estate, so He glorifies men that they may take part in His.

The other interpretation of *ὅτι*, regarding assimilation as the *effect* of vision ("we shall resemble Him, for to see Him as He is will make us such") instead of the precondition for the sight of the glorified Redeemer, contains a true idea ; but it is hardly relevant. Westcott's attempt to combine the two renderings makes confusion of the sense. Moreover, as he himself points out, *γενησόμεθα*, not *ἐσόμεθα*, would be the proper verb to express a consequent assimilation to Christ in the future estate of the saints, the growing effect of companionship with Him (cf. John xv. 8, 2 Cor. v. 21, Heb. iii. 14, etc.).

The future assimilation of state is prepared for by the pre-

sent assimilation of character; and the hope of the former is a keen incentive to the latter. This is the purport of verse 3, which brings us round again to the ground of assurance laid down in ii. 29. "Every one that has this hope set on Him (*ἐπ' αὐτῶ*:¹ on *Christ*, in continuation of verse 2; the hope of seeing Him *καθὼς ἐστίν*, of witnessing with full apprehension His *φανέρωσις*), purifies himself as He is pure." Moral likeness of spirit is the precondition of the likeness to their Lord in body and faculty constituting "the glory which shall be revealed to usward" (Rom. viii. 18). The transformation works from within outwards, according to the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus. The future body of the redeemed, as St. Paul teaches, will be "a spiritual body," fitted to the spirit that it clothes, whose organism and expression it is designed to be (1 Cor. xv. 42-49); and those who are like "the Heavenly One" in temper and disposition, will be like Him at last in frame and function. The ethical rules the material, which has no other use or significance but to be its vehicle. Place and state wait upon character and conduct: "If any man serve me," said Jesus, "let him follow me; and where I am, there shall also my servant be" (John xii. 26).

This imitation was enjoined in ii. 6: "He that saith he abideth in Him (in God), ought himself so to walk even as that One walked," words pointing to the earthly course of Jesus. What was there imposed as matter of plain duty and consistency, is here urged on the ground of hope and preparation for union with Christ in His heavenly estate.

¹ *ἐπίδα ἔχειν*, as distinguished from *ἐπίξω*, is to hold, possess a hope, thus regarded as a characteristic, or a cherished belonging, of the man; cf. *παρησίαν ἔχειν*, ii. 28, *κοινωνίαν ἔχειν*, i. 3; also Acts xxiv. 15, Eph. ii. 12. *ἐλπίς* (*ἐπίξω*) *ἐπί* with *dative* occurs here only and in 1 Tim. iv. 10, vi. 17 in the N.T.; and with *accusative*, in 1 Tim. v. 5, Rom. xv. 12, 1 Pet. i. 13. The force of the preposition is the same that it has with *πιστεύω*, *πέποιθα*, and other verbs denoting mental direction; it signifies a leaning against, a reliance upon the object. Our Lord's promises on this subject were the specific occasion and warrant of the hope in question. The *ἐπί* construction is common enough in the LXX.

The vivid demonstrative is again employed—"That One is pure"; while ἐπ' αὐτῷ and ἐκεῖνος here relate to the same person (Christ), there is this difference, that using ἐκεῖνος one looks away ("that one yonder"), not to the present *Christ* waiting to be manifested, but to the historical *Jesus*, whose pure image stands before us a living ideal, an abiding pattern of all that man should be.¹

The broad moral term δικαιοσύνη, defining in chap. ii. 29 the practical Christian character with its prototype in God, is now substituted by the fine and delicate ἀγνότης exemplified in Jesus. Both adjective and noun are rare in the New Testament; this is the only example afforded by St. John. The word does not signify a negative purity, the "cleanness" (καθαρότης) of one from whom defilement is removed (as in i. 7, John xv. 3, Matt. v. 8, etc.), which would never be ascribed to Jesus; this is a positive, chaste purity (cf. 2 Cor. xi. 2, Phil. iv. 8, Jas. iii. 17), the whiteness of virgin thoughts and an uncontaminated mind. The purity of the ἀγνός imports not the mere absence of and deliverance from corrupt passion, from baseness of desire and feeling, but a complete repugnance thereto, a moral incompatibility with any foulness, a spirit that resents the touch and breath of evil, that burns with a clear holy flame against all that is false and vile. The man who hopes to be like Him as He is, must be thus like Him as He was. To see Him, we must follow in His train; we must catch His temper and acquire His habit of mind, to breathe the atmosphere in which He dwells. The heavenly glory of the Lord Jesus, that He shares with His saints, is but the shining forth in Him, and in them, of the purity intrinsic to Him and veiled in the earthly state of discipline and testing. If this character is hereafter to be revealed, it must first be possessed; and to be possessed it must be learnt of Him.

GEORGE G. FINDLAY.

¹ Hence the present ἐστίν,—“as He is (not *was*) pure,” since the example has become perpetual and holds good for ever; cf. iv. 17.

*THE REVISED VERSION OF THE NEW
TESTAMENT.*

A PLEA FOR HESITATION AS TO ITS ADOPTION.

THE Centenary of the British and Foreign Bible Society has not unnaturally once more brought into increased prominence the proposals urged from time to time for the more extended use of the Revised Version, whether in public or in private, in preference to the Authorized Version. May I venture to put in, even thus late, a new and earnest plea for hesitation? To call in serious question the value of the work of so large and distinguished a body of scholars as the Revisers, must always have the appearance of presumption; but the matter appears to me so grave that, at all risks, "freedom of speech" is, in my opinion, not only justifiable, but, in the interests of truth and edification, a still imperative duty. The Revisers themselves were, as was admitted on all sides, not all of equal competence, either as textual critics or as Greek scholars, and their decisions were the decisions of majorities. While, then, it may rightly be maintained, as has often been urged, that the R.V. advantageously removes various obsolete expressions and other minor defects of the A.V., and throws light on sundry obscure passages, it must still be firmly asserted that it is burdened with more serious inaccuracies than it removes, and that, upon the whole, it falls far short of the merits of the old Version. I will not refer (or only very slightly) to the question of the *Greek Text*, framed by the Revisers for their basis, unduly influenced as it was by an over-estimate, at that time, of certain ancient authorities. I will simply crave indulgence while I call attention, by a few specimens, to their *erroneous renderings*, and indicate the seriousness of their character. Some or all of these have, doubtless, already been noticed and dealt with to

some extent by others; but I have of express purpose written independently of all others in the hope that fresh force may be added to the argument. I must, however, apologize to both scholars and general readers for the introduction of various grammatical and lexicographical elements, without which, out of regard to the authority of the Revisers, no conclusions of sufficient cogency could have been reached.

(a) Rom. iii. 9: "*Are we in worse case than they?*" No, by no means: for, etc." προεχόμεθα (A.V. "*Are we better than they?*"). I take this example first, as being one of the most startling, and (as I believe) one of the very worst of the Revisers' alterations. It shall be considered, as is necessary, from the points of view of both scholarship and context. Both here and in the subsequent passages to be noticed, internal criticism must be allowed much greater weight than the Revisers have given to it. Now, apart from context, the Greek word προεχόμεθα is in form either the *middle* or (as the Revisers take it) the *passive* voice of an active προέχειν, which has the various meanings of *holding in front of* another, *being in front of*, *excelling*. Of the *middle* voice there are extant examples on the sense of *holding in front of oneself* as a shield, pretext, etc.; as in Hdn. 172, προέχσθαι γήρας, "*putting forward as an excuse his old age.*" From this usage comes the marginal rendering in our verse, "*do we excuse ourselves?*" which seems to require, however, an object, as in the passage just cited. In the sense of *excel*, there is apparently no extant example in the *middle* voice. Of the *passive* voice there are extant undoubted examples in the sense of *to be excelled*: e.g. Plut. ii. 1038, "good men are not excelled even by Zeus himself." A choice, then, has to be made between the *middle* and the *passive*. Now if, as by the Revisers, the word be taken as *passive*, then the rendering suggested by examples will be, not "*in worse case,*" but

worse, morally worse, excelled by them morally. But the context repudiates such a signification. The rendering of the Revisers (if I may be pardoned for saying so) reduces the reasoning to an absurdity. S. Paul has been exhibiting the universal depravity of both Gentile (i. 18-32) and Jew (ii. 17-29); and what is absolutely certain is that whatever be the implied assertion in *προεχόμεθα*, he gives to it in his *οὐ πάντως*, "No, by no means," a most emphatic negative, and assigns his reason. Now with the Revisers' rendering, the argument will run thus: "The Gentiles are gross sinners: are we Jews, who have had the advantage of the Divine Oracles, in worse case than they? No, by no means: for our charge of sin has been laid against Jew as well as Gentile, and that in accordance with the Law, which speaks to us Jews, and declares us to be utterly sinful; "none of us righteous, no, not one." How is this answer a negative to the inquiry "Are we in worse case"? To suit the Revisers' rendering, the answer required would be: "No, by no means worse; for the Law justifies us." The *passive* sense, then, as interpreted by the Revisers, is ruled out by the context. On the other hand, if we accept the word as a *middle* voice, then, whether we take the marginal, "do we excuse ourselves?" or the A.V. "are we better than they?" there is at least no violence to the context. S. Paul's emphatic negative is suited to either. There remains, however, the question of grammar; that is: Can the *middle* voice be used like the *active* in the sense of *excel*? That it can be used for *excusing oneself* has already been seen. Now though there probably is no other extant example of the sense of *excel* in the *middle* voice in the surviving literature (extant confirmatory examples are wanting to many words), still there is ample justification for it in the genius of the language; that is to say, as the *passive* can signify *to be excelled*, so, in accordance with the laws of the language, the *middle*, like the *active*, can signify

to *excel*. Illustrations are found, e.g., in the use of the middle voice of other compounds of ἔχειν, as in ἀπέχεσθαι, ἀνέχεσθαι, ἀντέχεσθαι; also in the use of the active and middle voices of various verbs, such as ἐνεργεῖν and ἐνεργεῖσθαι, both *to work*; πληροῦν and πληροῦσθαι, both *to fill*; σφραγίζειν and σφραγίζεσθαι, both *to seal* (all in N.T.). I pass by, for the present, the case of Colossians ii. 15. So, then, both προέχειν and προέχεσθαι, so far as the laws of the language are concerned, can both signify *to excel*, the *middle* no less (probably even more fully) than the *active*. The result is that scholarship sanctions the sense which the context demands. *Do we excel? Have we any moral pre-eminency?* Or, simply and preferably, as A.V., “*Are we better than they?*” And this is retained by the American Revisers. So the Vulgate *præcellimus*; so also plainly the old variant Greek reading προκατέχομεν, “*are we superior?*” and the Old Latin *tenemus amplius?*

(b) Rom. v. 1, “*let us have peace with God*”; reading ἔχωμεν (A.V. “*we have peace*”; reading ἔχομεν). The context is decisive against this change, which vitiates S. Paul’s argument, and introduces a serious error of doctrine. S. Paul is treating of the *effects* of justification through the propitiation made by Christ, and enforces that one of these effects is *perfect reconciliation with God* (vv. 9, 10; cf. iii. 24, 25). But *perfect reconciliation* implies *peace*: the enmity no longer exists. It is not a matter for exhortation, but of declaration; and so “*we have peace.*” So Colossians i. 20, “*reconcile all things, having made peace through the blood,*” etc. And so expressly, as the very essence of the Gospel, Acts x. 36: “*preaching the glad tidings of peace through Jesus Christ.*” Further, this is apparent from the addition of the word “*also*” in v. 2: “*We have peace through our Lord, through whom also we have had access.*” Change *we have* into *let us have*, and the *also* is unmeaning. (For similar uses of “*also*” by S. Paul,

cf. viii. 17; xi. 16; 2 Cor. iii. 6; Eph. i. 11; Phil. iii. 20; Col. ii. 10-12). Why then did the Revisers make such a change? Because, ignoring internal evidence, they deemed ἔχωμεν with ω a better attested textual reading than ἔχομεν with ο. But the interchange of these two vowels in MSS. is so common that against clear internal evidence it is not worth serious consideration. It occurs, e.g., in our previous passage, iii. 9, in the very word there discussed (προεχώμεθα for προεχόμεθα), and also in 1 Cor. xv. 49 with far better attestation than here (φορέσωμεν, *let us wear*, instead of φορέσομεν, *we shall wear*); but the Revisers have in both cases wisely shrunk from the change. We must decidedly retain the A.V. "*we have peace*"; the American Revisers likewise retain it.

(c) 1 Cor. vi. 7, "Nay, already it is altogether a *defect in you* that ye have lawsuits one with another." ἡττημα and ὑμῶν (A.V. *a fault among you*; reading ἐν ὑμῶν). What? Merely a "*defect in you*" after the "Nay, already" — ἡδη standing the first word—and after the indignant inquiry of v. 1, "*Dare any of you go to law before the unrighteous?*" No; S. Paul, who loves to illustrate and enforce his appeals by use of the technical terms of soldier life, of the public games, commerce, etc., here makes use of one (as of other) of the technical terms of the law-courts, ἡττημα, a *loss of suit, loss of cause, defeat* (cf. the corresponding verb ἡττᾶσθαι, *to lose one's cause, be defeated*, in the Greek Oratt.); and he uses it with a scornful *oxymoron*, to which his "*nay, already*" gives force: "Go to law? Why, already, at the very outset, it is a *loss of your cause, a defeat to you* [not *in you*] that ye have any lawsuits at all one with another." Unquestionably this is the meaning. If the marginal "*loss to you*" be intended for *loss of cause*, then it has caught the right meaning; but the word "*loss*" by itself is too general, and misses the sarcasm. *Loss of cause* might stand; but for a single word, "*defeat*" is the

technical term, and should be adopted: "Nay, already it is a *defeat* to you," etc. This is also the more clear from the correct reading *ὑμῖν*, not *ἐν ὑμῖν*.

(d) 1 Cor. xv. 27, "But *when he saith*, all things are put in subjection, it is evident that he is excepted," etc., *ὅταν εἴπῃ* . . . *δῆλον ὅτι ἔκτος τοῦ, κ.τ.λ.* (A.V. *when he saith all*, etc.). It is incomprehensible to me how the Revisers have gone wrong here. To begin with, their rendering of *ὅταν εἴπῃ* is ungrammatical; and the words "*All things are*," etc., are not, as they imply, a repetition of the citation from Psalm viii. 6, "*He hath put all things in subjection.*" This is already shown by the use of the *perfect ὑποτέτακται*, instead of an aorist, *ὑπέταξεν*, as in the Psalm. The Apostle is not turning aside to guard the citation from misconstruction of its scope, but is directing his glowing thought to the glorious moment of its perfect fulfilment, when the cry shall go forth of the completion of the subjugation of the Son's enemies. The *ὅταν εἴπῃ* marks that moment; viz. *when he shall say*, not *when he saith* (for this *ὅταν* cf. *vv.* 24, 54; *xiii.* 10; *Col.* iii. 4); and the words "*it is evident that he is excepted*," which should rather be rendered, "*evidently excepting him*" (there is no verb, only the adverbial *δηλόνοσι* and the prep. *ἔκτος*), merely introduce a *parenthesis*, the main statement being resumed by the *ὅταν δὲ*, but *when* (not "*and when*") of *v.* 28. (For a similar parenthesis with *δηλόνοσι* and similar resumption see *Xen. Cyr.* ii. 3.) Carefully noting, then, the force of the pf. *ὑποτέτακται* (cf. the pf. *τετέλεσται*, *it is finished*, *John* xix. 30), we arrive at the true and grand meaning: "But *when* He shall say, All things are now become subject—evidently excepting him who, etc.—but *when*, I say, all things shall have become subject, *then* shall the Son also become subject, that God may be all in all."

(e) 2 Cor. ii. 13, 14, "I had no relief . . . But thanks be to God, who always *leadeth us in triumph* in Christ."

θριαμβεύει (A.V. *causeth us to triumph*). It shall at once be admitted that, except it be in this passage, there is no extant example of the *causative* force of the Greek word here employed. In the only other passage in which it occurs in the New Testament, viz. in Colossians ii. 15, it is rendered *triumph over* (a rendering, curiously enough, possibly for ambiguity's sake, avoided here by the Revisers), and there, and in all the instances found in secular literature, it is the term used for a conqueror's celebration of triumph over vanquished foes: "*He leads them in triumph, triumphs over them.*" How emphatic and appropriate this meaning is in Colossians ii. 15 for the triumph of Christ or the Father over the vanquished "powers" of darkness is obvious. But how utterly inappropriate and impossible here! Christ is the Vanquisher, not the vanquished; and "*in Christ*" Christians are not vanquished and "*led in triumph,*" but "*more than conquerors*" (Rom. viii. 37).

They share their Leader's victory,
And triumph with their King.

Nor, to deal with the possibly intended ambiguity of the Revisers' phrase, may it be replied that the meaning can be that Christians are "*led in triumph in Christ*" as *co-victors*. The term never had and cannot bear such meaning; victors are not *led*, but *lead* (cf. Gell. ii. 11. 4, "*triumphavit cum imperatoribus suis*"). No; human relief had failed the Apostle, but as in his previous epistle, xv. 57, he had exclaimed, "*But thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory,*" so here he exclaims, "*But thanks be to God, who causeth us to triumph.*" It remains, of course, to examine whether this *causative* force of the Greek word is ruled out by the absence of other extant examples of its use (cf. above, under Rom. iii. 9). It certainly is not so ruled out. There is abundant evidence, especially in our late Greek, of the *causative* use of the verbs ending, as our present

word does, in *-εϵνν*, and sometimes with only one extant example. In the New Testament itself, e.g., we have *μαθητεύειν*, which signifies *to be a disciple*, used in the sense of *cause to be a disciple* (Matt. xxviii. 19; Acts xiv. 41); *περισσεύειν*, *to abound*, used for *cause to abound* (2 Cor. iv. 15; ix. 87); and in Septuagint of Old Testament *βασιλεύειν*, *to be a king*, used in the sense of *cause to be a king* (1 Chron. xxix. 22). Other instances are *εἰρηνεύειν*, *to be at peace*, and *cause to be at peace*; *ἐνδρεύειν*, *to lie in ambush*, and *cause to lie in ambush*; *πρεσβεύειν*, *to have precedence*, and *cause to have precedence*. The usage is perfectly clear. Thus, on grammatical grounds, no sound reason exists for refusing to our *θριαμβεύειν* the possible sense of *causing to triumph* as well as *to triumph*; and, as this is the sense demanded by the context, the Revisers' rendering must be rejected, and the A.V. retained, "*Thanks be to God, who causeth us to triumph in Christ.*"

(f) 2 Cor. iii. 18, "But we all, with unveiled face *reflecting-as-a-mirror* the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory." *Κατοπτριζόμενοι* (A.V. *beholding-as-in-a-glass*, sc. *as in a mirror*). The minor changes made by the Revisers in this verse (*unveiled, transformed*) are sound and serviceable, but the main alteration, *reflecting* for *beholding*, is wholly unwarrantable and highly detrimental. However plausible it may appear at first sight, it will not bear close examination, but is condemned alike by scholarship and by context. S. Paul does indeed for a moment, in passing, draw a contrast between the act of Moses in "*veiling his face*" and the "*boldness of speech*" of himself and his fellow-apostles (vv. 12, 13); but the main contrast of the whole of his exposition in this and the following chapter is totally different, viz. between the *abiding veil* on the Jewish people and the *removal of the veil* in Christ. Our verse, then, to be rightly understood, must be studied in the light

of the entire context (iii. 1-iv. 6), and of the historical reference in Exodus xxxiv. 29-35, especially as this appears in the Septuagint version, from which several special words are exactly reproduced in this chapter. But, before considering the context, it is essential to examine into the meaning of the word *κατοπτριζόμενοι* itself, and ascertain whether the Revisers have any justification for their change by reason of the Greek usage of the word. Absolutely none. Independently of this verse and of comments thereon, there does not exist (I believe I am right in so saying) a single example in all Greek literature of the use of *any one of the three* voices of the verb, *active, passive, or middle*, supporting the sense of *to reflect*. It has absolutely nothing to rest upon. The Greek word for *to reflect* is a totally different word, *ἐμφαίνειν, ἐμφαίνεσθαι*, with its noun *ἐμφασίς* for the *reflexion*; e.g., Plat. *Rep.* 402, "images, whether they be *reflected* (*ἐμφαίνουιντο*) in still waters or in mirrors." On the other hand, the word *κατοπτρίζεσθαι* is the everyday Greek word for *using a mirror, looking at oneself in a looking-glass, contemplating one's own image* or the image of anything else reflected in a mirror of any kind; the *mirror* and the *image, speculi imago*, being correlative terms. Thus Artemidorus has an entire section entitled, *περὶ τοῦ κατοπτρίζεσθαι*, "*Concerning looking at oneself in a mirror.*" It begins with the words, "*To look into a mirror* (*κατοπτρίζεσθαι*) and see one's own image like to oneself," etc. (ii. 7). He uses the compound *ἐγκατοπτρίζεσθαι* in the same sense. The delight of Aphrodite is *κατοπτρίζεσθαι*, "*to survey herself in the mirror*" (*Athen.* v. 687). We are reminded of Mr. Loudan's picture in the Royal Academy of this year:—

Mirror, mirror on the wall,
Am I most beautiful of all?

For ethical reasons, Socrates recommended all young men

frequently κατοπτρίζεσθαι, "to look at themselves in the glass." Plato gave the same advice to drunkards (Diog. L. ii. 33; iii. 39; cited by Schleusner). These are all examples of the ordinary and literal sense. The *metaphorical* sense is well seen in the noble passage of S. Paul's contemporary, Phil. J. i. 106, 7 (possibly known to S. Paul, and having several notable words common to his epistles and to the Epistle to the Hebrews): "God is the archetype of the image, and the image becomes the archetype of others, etc. He who is initiated in the mysteries judges not that which is abiding from the shadow, but receives a clear reflexion (ἐμφασιν) of the uncreated. Such is Moses, who says, "Manifest thyself to me" [Exod. xxxiii. 13]: sc. Do not manifest thyself to me by anything created, etc., neither let me behold (κατοπτριζόμενω) thy form as in a mirror in aught but in thyself, O God: for reflexions (ἐμφάσεις) in created things melt away." Thus, then, both the literal and the metaphorical meaning, *behold as in a mirror*, are beyond dispute, and *usage produces no other*. Does the context, then, which is the next branch of the inquiry, demand or even suggest the abandonment of so indisputable a signification in favour of another which is purely fictitious? The very reverse is the case. It may safely be premised, without any *petitio principii*, that the contrast enforced in caps. iii. and iv. is a contrast between *spiritual blindness* and *spiritual enlightenment*; also that the first words of our verse, "but we all," indicate that not the Apostles alone, but the whole body of Christian believers, are the subject of the verse. S. Paul, having repudiated the charge of self-commendation (v. 1), could not apply the language of this verse to some specially glorious transformation of himself and his fellows alone. But neither in the case of S. Paul and his fellows, nor in the case of the whole body of believers, can the contrast intended be between the "unveiled face" on the one side

and the "veiled face" of Moses on the other. For the face of Moses also was as entirely "unveiled," so it is expressly stated, when he delivered the oracles of God as when he received them: only "*when he had done speaking*" did he put the veil on: with "*face unveiled*" he went in to see and commune with the Lord (Exod. *l.c.*). So too in our verse the phrase "*unveiled face,*" ἀνακεκαλυμμένω, pf. pass. tense, signifies not merely a face *without a veil*, but a face, so far like that of Moses, *from which a veil previously worn has been removed*. Such removal of the veil suggests in the one case what is emphasized in the other, that the purpose of the act is for *seeing* and not for *reflecting*. The intended contrast, then, not being with Moses, must be with the Jewish people at large who believe not in Christ, whose hearts are darkened and their perceptions blunted that they cannot bear or see the surpassing glory of the gospel, even as their fathers could not look steadfastly on the minor glory of the Law. Now what can the contrast be to this condition? To *fail to see* and to *reflect* are not a contrast in terms, but to *fail to see* and to *see* are the contrast; to "*behold with unveiled face,*" not to *reflect*. But, in addition to missing the evident requirement of the contrasted terms, the rendering *reflect* introduces a most unnatural confusion of metaphors, viz. that the *mirrors*, instead of merely *reflecting the image*, are themselves transformed into and *become the image*, "*transformed into the same image.*" Thus the context, no less than scholarship, rejects the R.V. rendering, and compels adherence to the A.V. *behold*. The fine sense of the original may be seen by a paraphrase: "The Jewish people, veiled and blinded, see not the glory of the gospel; but all are believers in Christ, from whose faces the old veil of ignorance and unbelief has been perfectly removed, though the direct beatific vision is not yet, yet beholding and contemplating as in a mirror the reflected glory of the Lord, even Him who is

the Image of the Invisible (Col. i. 15) and the Brightness of His glory (Heb. i. 3) are gradually transformed (*μεταμορφούμεθα*, *pres.*) into the same image, from one degree of glory to another, under the operation of the Spirit." And so, without paraphrase, "But we all, *beholding as in a mirror* the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image," etc. No other rendering is possible. To cite once more from Philo, the following passage (ii. 426) is a remarkably happy illustration of S. Paul's thought, and even of his language. Philo says, "The continuous impressions produced by noble examples engrave on all but very hardened souls *images nearly resembling the originals*. Whence it comes that those who are willing to imitate noble and admirable qualities are bidden not to despair of the *change for the better*." In paraphrase: All but hardened souls, contemplating any noble examples, are changed into the image of those whom they would imitate. The change comes by *beholding*, not *reflecting*; and it is a change into the *image* of the exemplars. S. Paul and Philo are at one.

(g) Col. ii. 15, "Having put off from himself the principalities and powers he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them." ἀπεκδυσάμενος (A.V., *having spoiled*, sc. *despoiled*). The Revisers mean *having stript off from himself* as one strips off a garment, etc., or as a serpent sloughs his skin (see below). It is at once a serious objection that the meaning of their rendering is (as in many other cases) unintelligible without reference to the Greek. The more serious and fatal objection is that their rendering lacks congruity and adequate introduction to the triumphant words that follow. Once more the Revisers have grievously impaired the sense by ignoring the capability of the Greek middle voice, of which ἀπεκδυσάμενος is an example, adopting a signification which undoubtedly, apart from

any demands of context, is perfectly legitimate by itself, viz., *stripping oneself*, and rejecting another equally admissible, which is demanded by the context, viz., *stripping another*. These points demand and shall have full examination. The word in question is the *middle* voice of an *active* form ἀπεκδύειν, which, in regard to the sense of *stripping another*, some might have expected to find used in this passage rather than the *middle*. This *active*, however, was very rarely, even if ever, employed (the instances sometimes cited from Babrius and Josephus are incorrect readings), but if employed would certainly signify to *put off* a garment either *from oneself* or *from another* (cf. the act. μετεκδύς, Jos. Ant. vi. 14, of Saul *putting off his own royal robe*; and the act. ἐκδιδύσκειν, 1 Sam. xxxi. 8, Gr., of soldiers *stripping the slain*). The *middle* ἀπεκδύεσθαι, our word, is likewise exceedingly rare, but undoubtedly can have for a meaning both lit. and metaph., to *put off from oneself* as a garment is put off. So it is used metaph. in the only other passage of its occurrence in the New Testament, viz., iii. 9 of this epistle (“*put off the old man*”); and similarly the related noun ἀπέκδυσις in v. 11 (“the *putting off* of the body of the flesh”). So also two other compounds of δύνειν in the *middle* voice, ἐνδύεσθαι, ἀποδύεσθαι, are respectively used, both lit. and metaph., of *putting on* and *putting off* or *divesting oneself* of clothing, virtues and vices, infirmities, and even teachers, in reference to embracing, submitting to or renouncing their teaching, etc. (See the phrases in New Testament, *putting off* the old man, *putting on* the new, *putting on* Christ, *putting on* immortality, compassion, etc., Rom. xiii. 14; 1 Cor. xv. 53-4; Gal. iii. 27; Col. iii. 9-12). All this is undeniable, and claims consideration. So I have purposely stated it fully. But now, apart altogether from the question of context, can it therefore be said, by any reasonable stretch of the metaphor, *pace* some patristic

comments, that Christ, by His assumption of human nature, had so "*put on the principalities and powers*" of darkness that He could similarly be said to "*put them off*"? For if He "*put them off*" or *divested Himself of them* in any sense, He must certainly first have *put them on*, or *invested Himself in them* in that sense, and exhibited them in his life and character. But it seems incredible that, to describe Christ's subjection to the infirmities and sufferings of our nature, S. Paul should have resorted to so extraordinary a phrase as that He "*put on the principalities and powers.*" Clearer and simpler phrases were ready to his hand. But still more incredible would the phrase be if the subject of the verb be not *Christ*, but *God the Father*. And this supposition, even if not (as seems) the more probable, cannot be lightly put aside. *God the Father* is certainly and obviously the subject in the immediately preceding verses, 12-14, and our *v.* 15 begins without any notified change of subject. Now *God the Father*, at all events, never *put on* or *put off* the "*principalities and powers.*" If, however, the Apostle have abruptly and without any notice changed the subject of his verbs and made Christ the subject without naming Him, then, if it were really necessary to adopt the sense of *stripping oneself* rather than that of *stripping another*, we should be forced to follow the Syriac version and some of the Fathers in taking our ἀπεκδυσάμενος absolutely, and making the words "*principalities and powers*" dependent on the following verb, thus: "*Stripping himself* [sc. as an athlete for a contest] *he made an open shew of the principalities and powers.*" But this seems utterly incongruous and inadequate, and the order of the Greek words militates against it. We are thus finally brought to the decisive inquiry whether the *middle* voice ἀπεκδυσάμενος, even without extant confirmatory examples, can be used like the Latin *exuere* in the *active* sense of *stripping another*, as well as in the reflexive sense of *stripping oneself*. Such a use is perfectly consistent with

the laws of the Greek language ; and solitary instances of many words and significations abound in the extant literature. The *middle* voice of a large number of verbs is used almost interchangeably with the *active*, with modified shades of meaning (cf. the use of the med. ἤλάσατο, *drove*, and not the act., in Plat. *Gorg.* 484, of the act of the hero in driving off the spoil). Illustrations may be found in such *middle* forms as ἀπογράφεσθαι, *to register oneself*, but also *to register others* ; ἀπολύεσθαι, *to free oneself*, but also *to free others* ; and a very exact parallel to our word, περιαιρείσθαι, *to strip off from oneself*, but also *to strip off from others*. So, then, with our ἀπεκδέεσθαι, as with the Lat. *exuere*, *to strip others* is as fully admissible a sense, on grammatical grounds, as the sense of *stripping oneself* ; and, for this sense of *stripping others*, the *middle* voice may not improbably have been specially chosen by the Apostle in preference to the *active* (even if in use), for the purpose of emphasizing principal (semi-reflexive) rather than ministerial agency. At length, then, we have a clear and undeniable sense which alone accords with the subject of the main verb, whether that subject be Christ or whether it be God the Father, and which also is a fitting introduction to the exultant close of the verse. The final words indicate that to the Apostle's mind was present the pageant (often witnessed) of some notable conqueror, who, for the greater glory of his triumph, causes the vanquished princes to be *stripped* of their dignities and princely vestures, and "*puts them to open shame*" in his triumphal progress before their execution. This picture, a glorious one, he transfers in rapturous language to the triumph of Christ or the Father ; and its masterly touches more and more convincingly impress us : "*Having stript* the principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly [*or boldly made them a public spectacle*], triumphing over them." The A.V. "*spoiled*" (like the Rheims "*despoiled*," following the

Vulg. *expolians*) maintains the general splendour of the picture, but misses the striking effect of the detail. For modern readers, however, unacquainted with antiquity, “*spoiled*” or “*despoiled*” may still be the more forcible. It may be desirable to add, in confirmation (if need be) of the reference of the triumph to *God the Father*, that it is to the “mighty working” of *the Father* that S. Paul elsewhere ascribes the resurrection and glorification of Christ at His right hand, thus, notwithstanding the crucifixion and death, “despoiling the powers and triumphing over them in Him,” i.e. in Christ.

I have ventured to select the above out of many examples, and dwell at some length upon them, under a deep sense of their importance, doctrinally and otherwise. On the many minor inaccuracies which, I am sorry to believe, disfigure almost every page of the R.V., I have neither space nor wish here to dwell. The A.V., it is true, also has its blemishes and imperfections, but they fade almost into insignificance in comparison with the serious errors of the Revised. The Version of James’ translation is more true to the genius of the English language, and characterized in more directions than one by more profound scholarship. Until both Text and Translation be made much more perfect, it involves much less wrong and much less loss to the churches to retain the old Version.

J. B. McCLELLAN.

CONSCIENCE AND CREED.

(1) THAT a man himself is as he thinks of God, is a truth on which stress has often been laid by the theological teacher, to whom I gratefully acknowledge my deepest debt—Principal Fairbairn. That a man thinks of God as he himself is, is its companion truth, which must not be for-

gotten or neglected. Browning, in his poem "Caliban on Setebos," presents that truth in a striking, if grotesque, form. Religion shapes morality, but is itself moulded in turn. A man's creed may enlighten or darken his conscience, but his conscience too may make or mar his creed. If morality be the realization by man of his ideal, and if religion be man's assurance that his ideal has reality in God, then it becomes clear that the human ideal and the divine reality must in the mind of man sink or soar together. That religious superstition brings moral corruption Paul in his terrible indictment of the heathenism of his own world and age has shown; but he had been anticipated by Plato, who in his ideal state found it necessary to forbid much of the popular mythology in the education of the citizens on account of its pernicious moral influence; and by Lucretius, who denounced the great evils to which religion persuaded mankind. The philosopher and the poet alike illustrate the revolt of conscience against creed, which has been a characteristic feature of human progress in many lands and times. For man's consciousness of God and his conscience of duty have not always grown together, and religion has often been conservative while morality has been progressive. Even in the history of the Christian Church has this protest of conscience against creed again and again been repeated, and there has been, after much conflict, as a result of this protest, a transformation of theological ideas in accordance with ethical principles. It would be interesting and instructive to follow throughout the course of the history of the Christian Church—the mutual action and reaction of these two factors in its life and work—Conscience and Creed; but I cannot here make any such attempt. My purpose in dealing with this theme will be sufficiently served, if I can illustrate and interpret the influence of ethics on theology in recent times, in the present phase of our Christian religion and morality. For

what after all concerns and interests us most of all is the atmosphere, mental, moral, and spiritual, which we ourselves are breathing, in which we live, and move, and have our being.

(2) May I venture before entering on the subject proper to refer to the fact, that Christian ethics is slowly winning recognition in theological studies and literature, as itself an illustration of this influence of conscience on creed? In spite of the prominence of ethics in the teaching of Jesus and His apostles, the Christian Church has hitherto paid much more attention to dogmatics, the definition of the objects of faith, than to Christian ethics, the exposition of the ideal of life; there is far less literature, which has become classical, on Christian duty than on Christian doctrine; the scientific study of Christian morality as such is of comparatively recent date; there still are theological colleges in Britain where no instruction in this science is provided; in the requirements for some theological degrees it is not included at all, in others it is still only an alternative and not a necessary, subject. But a wiser and better view is surely, if slowly, gaining ground. In the pulpit more attention is being given to the moral demands of the Christian faith; in the press the discussion of the application of the ethical principles of Jesus to social problems grows apace; the colleges are awakening to discover that they have been neglecting something which essentially belongs to the thorough furnishing of the man of God for every good work; it is no vain prophecy that in the future Christian ethics will be studied as carefully and thoroughly, as its companion discipline, Christian dogmatics, has been in the past. That this change is altogether for good who can doubt? The world around is making with ever greater urgency this demand on the Christian Church. Show thy faith by thy works, prove divine grace in human duty, make clear and sure the

efficacy and sufficiency of the Christian salvation by the solution of the Social Problem. Nay, because too often the demand is not fully and promptly met, the world is casting at the Christian Church the taunt, that its boast to possess the divine secret for enlightening, quickening, cleansing, and renewing human life is vain, and that its moral impotence shows its religious unreality. We have no right to refuse this challenge, or to resent this provocation. This is no other than the test which Christ Himself proposed, that the tree is known by its fruits. The present conditions offer to the Christian Church its great opportunity, and lay upon it its great obligation to show itself possessed of a divine enthusiasm and a divine energy for the redemption of the whole manhood of all mankind. But this enthusiasm must be controlled, and this energy must be directed by a divine enlightenment. Zeal and strength need the guidance of knowledge. Never was the study of Christian ethics more of a practical necessity in the Christian Church than at the present day, and the growing recognition of the importance of this subject is a cheering sign that we are beginning to discover, not only how great our need of this guidance is, but also how best it may be met. In the teaching, example, and Spirit of Jesus Christ we may find our marching orders for the crusade to which we are being called by the loud cries of the many and varied evils of the age as well as by the quiet inward voice of the Captain of our salvation in our own consciences. We may, therefore, heartily welcome as a sign of the triumph of the ethical spirit in the Church this growing interest in, and attention to, the scientific study of the distinctively Christian morality.

(3) That during the century just closed, Christian theology passed through what can without exaggeration be described as a revolution, I need not now pause to prove. Compare any characteristic theological work of the

eighteenth century with one of the nineteenth, and you will find not only a change of verbal phrase, but even of mental mode. The scientific attitude, the philosophical tendency, the critical spirit, the historical method of the one century were so different from all the intellectual conditions of the other, that it was inevitable that theology, which cannot be kept in mental isolation, but must be affected by its mental environment, should pass through a far-reaching change, which not a few sincere and earnest Christians dread and deplore, while others rejoice in, and welcome it. There can be no question that there are current tendencies in theological thought, which are nothing else, or less than, a deadly danger to Christian faith. The historical method, when pushed to the extreme of a denial of the supernatural in the Christian facts, is a fatal menace to the Christian life. The scientific mind, which can think only in the categories of matter and motion, is in irreconcilable antagonism to the Christian spirit. The Rational Press Association Reprints of books of such tendency at the low price of sixpence, which has secured for them a circulation of many thousands, and has carried this anti-Christian thought into the homes of the common people, are an ominous sign of the times, a challenge to the Christian Church to protect and preserve the essential contents of its creed, while ready to meet difficulty and relieve doubt by all necessary and legitimate modifications of its intellectual forms. For on the other hand there are current tendencies in theological thought which are not alien to the Christian faith, but are its inevitable intellectual expression under the existing conditions. If modern science in its principles, methods, and results has been one of the most potent factors in bringing about this alteration of doctrine, if modern criticism has introduced a new standpoint in dealing with the Scriptures, yet it is no less true that the ethical spirit of the age has been beneficently at work in leading us to

think otherwise about God and man, and their relation, than our fathers did. It should reconcile us to some of the new views, if it can be shown that these are due, if not entirely, yet mainly, to the influence of conscience on creed, that they seek to restore the disturbed harmony of morality and religion, that their claim as truth rests on their worth as righteousness. There are two ways in which ethics can affect theology. It may demand that the supreme object of faith and worship shall correspond with the absolute ideal of duty and good; that is, that man shall believe that God possesses perfectly all those moral excellencies which man seeks to attain progressively, that man shall refuse to assign to God any defect which he would be ashamed of in himself. Secondly, it may demand that the relation between man and God recognized shall include the obligations of, and the inducement to, the duties which he acknowledges as binding in his relations to his fellow-men; in other words, that as God is the ultimate, sovereign, all-inclusive, all-regulative reality, all man's other relations shall be duly recognized in this relation to God. Adopting and adapting the words of the Hebrew prophet, ethics demands of theology that doing justly and loving mercy shall be inseparable from walking humbly with God. Ethics claims that theology shall be true to the apostolic statement, that God is light, and in Him is no darkness; and that they who walk in His light shall have no fellowship with the unprofitable works of darkness.

(4) On each of these considerations it seems necessary to dwell for a few moments in order to give to them their due emphasis. The first of them has not been as fully recognized by Christian theologians as it should have been. Under cover of the assertion of the inscrutable mystery of the works and ways of God, purposes and practices have been assigned to Him which in men would have been condemned as immoral. Dean Mansel, for instance, denied the

right of reason on moral grounds to criticize revelation, and maintained that God might subject man to moral laws, by which He did not feel Himself bound. That profane position, however, has met with the contempt which it deserved. Most theologians would now admit that our moral ideal must have reality in God, if it is to claim realization in us. Just as to the scientific agnosticism of Spencer, who argues that as the inscrutable reality may be more than personal, we have no right to assign personality to it, Christian thought must reply that God must be at least personal, whatever more He may be, as personality is our highest conceivable category, so to this theological agnosticism of Mansel, that we cannot apply to God our moral standards, it must reply, that we must conceive God as at least as moral as man knows that he himself should be. Just because God is infinitely better than even our ideals, must we believe that He is as good as, and cannot be less good than, man. The elevation, purification, and expansion of man's conscience for himself must, therefore, be accompanied by a corresponding transformation in his consciousness of God, if there is not to be in his inmost life that rift within the lute which makes its music mute. Much of the spiritual unrest of this age is due to the felt discord between moral and religious convictions. When this first demand of ethics on theology, that God shall be conceived as the absolute moral perfection has been met, the legitimacy of the second must be recognized. Morality must not be regarded as existing alongside of religion in a friendly alliance with it, but must be acknowledged as an essential element in it. If the moral ideal be reality in God, then its realization in man must belong organically, vitally, to the relation of God and man. God cannot desire or require from man anything inconsistent with, or even unrelated to, the human imitation of the divine perfection. In many heathen religions it is true religion and morality

are divorced, but this is one of their most glaring defects. The Hebrew prophets denounced the separation of ritual from righteousness in the popular religion of their own land. Christ and His apostles said much about moral duty, little about religious worship; they were interested in moral principles, indifferent to religious rites. Nevertheless the Christian Church during many centuries lapsed to the standpoint of heathenism, and the popular Hebrew religion, and offered God sacrifice instead of showing man mercy. The Protestant movement was a moral reformation as well as a religious revival, because it restored the duties of common life to their right place as parts of divine service. In Protestant Churches, however, orthodoxy has sometimes been unduly valued, and morality insufficiently appreciated. Around us we see churches attaching more importance to sacraments than to justice and charity. So ineradicable seems to be this tendency to substitute ritual ordinances for righteous performances, that it is as necessary now as ever to insist that goodness is what the Infinite and Eternal Goodness wants as man's acceptable sacrifice and reasonable service.

(5) Having thus defined the two directions in which the influence of conscience on creed is to be sought, we may now consider some illustrations which recent theology offers. The antithesis between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism has sometimes been formulated thus, that the supreme authority for the one is the Church, and for the other the Bible. It is true that it has been maintained of late by many Protestants that the Bible claims our reverence only as it leads us to Christ, and that He alone claims the submission of our minds to His divine truth. But, even if this should prove a position acceptable to Protestants generally, the change in the conception and estimate of the Bible which it involves cannot but be regarded as one of the most significant revolutions in

modern thought, to which we must first of all direct our attention in order to discover whether and how far the ethical spirit of the age must be regarded as one of the factors in bringing it about. I do deeply deplore the rash conjectures and the vain speculations about the Bible to which the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, so inconsistently with what such a publication should be, has given wide-spread currency, because it brings into suspicion and contempt the whole critical movement, which, in its sober and serious representatives, has a claim, not only to the tolerance, but even to the gratitude, of the Christian Church. I do not claim to be an expert in these matters, but as a student of theology deeply interested in the wider issues for Christian thought of this modern scholarship, I have been led to the conclusion that this critical position has so far established itself, that theology must frankly and fully reckon with it. In this connexion Professor George Adam Smith has used an unfortunate phrase; he speaks of fixing the indemnity; to me it would seem more fit and just to say, that we may now calculate the dividend; for I am persuaded that the Holy Scriptures, studied according to these modern methods, gain not only in literary value and historical significance, but that theological thought itself is relieved of burdens it bore formerly, and is enriched with treasures that it had not hitherto gained. Especially from the ethical standpoint is there gain and not loss in the critical results. The moral difficulties of the Old Testament, a favourite topic with secularist and agnostic lecturers and writers, such as Abraham's attempted sacrifice of Isaac, Jephtha's actual sacrifice of his daughter, Jael's treacherous murder of Sisera, the extermination of the Canaanites, Samuel's hewing Agag to pieces, the immoralities and cruelties of David, Elijah's slaughter of the priests of Baal, cannot be dealt with from the traditional standpoint without producing moral confusion; but the recognition of a

gradual progress in divine revelation, conditioned at each stage by a slow moral and religious human development, makes the task of the Christian apologist much easier. When we are set at liberty to believe that God neither commanded nor approved what our conscience compels us to condemn, but only caused His light to shine ever more brightly amid much darkness in men, then our faith is relieved of a painful strain, and a stumbling-block is removed from the path to truth for those who are still seekers. The literary and historical arguments, the strength of which I admit, are for me reinforced by the ethical significance and value in removing such moral difficulties of this modern view of this slow growth of the divine light, life, and love in human history.

(6) I go a step further, and affirm that this conception of progress in revelation is one which commends itself to an enlightened conscience. The moral life in the individual as in society is a gradual development; there are no leaps and bounds in conscience and character, but only a going on step by step. Moral ideas inspire moral efforts, and moral efforts prepare for moral ideas of loftier reach, which in turn result in moral efforts of larger range. The reason for this gradual development is that only that has moral worth which is moral gain; moral good cannot be given, but must be won; conscience can be enlightened only as character is formed. If revelation be conceived as a divine communication, which is not conditioned by the conscience and character of the recipient, and is not adapted to the stage of development of those for whom it is intended, it loses its moral meaning and worth. But if it is conceived as a progressive illumination of the mind by God, dependent on a gradual submission of the life to God, then it is ethically conceived. For men still growing towards perfection, and bounded by their imperfection, a revelation ideally defective is really effective from this moral stand-

point. As the modern critical view of the formation of the Bible recognizes this necessary moral condition in the progress of revelation, it may be pronounced a more truly ethical view than the traditional is. But, further, the critical view brings into prominence, as the traditional had not, the contribution to man's ethical thought which the Hebrew revelation has brought. We owe it to the higher critics that the prophets live for our intelligence and imagination, sympathy and reverence, as they never did for any previous generation. Writings that were mysterious have become luminous. The ethical spirit is in the prophets in clearest sincerity and strongest intensity. That God demands righteousness in all social relations and national policies is the message which these men delivered to their own age, and which their writings are imparting still. If criticism has in any way weakened the external attestations of the Old Testament revelation, miracle and prediction, although it has not at all to the extent commonly believed, it has greatly strengthened the internal evidence in the exposition which it has made possible of the moral mission of the prophets. As for this modern standpoint Christ has become the luminous centre of the New Testament, from which divine illumination radiates to the whole, so the prophets are the focus of the divine light which falls on Hebrew history. Before leaving this subject let me remove a possible misconception. I do not believe that the critical position involves, as some of its advocates and many of its opponents maintain, that the progress of revelation can be regarded as a natural evolution. Neither does the ethical standpoint with which I have tried to show that the critical position is in accord involve, that the distinctive action of God, which we describe as supernatural, was absent. Neither criticism nor ethics is under any necessity of, or derives any advantage from, a denial of the fact of the divine activity; but the mode in which criticism

enables us to conceive this divine action, as a gracious adaptation of God's gifts and claims to man's needs and powers appears to me as more significant and valuable ethically. Accordingly the ethical spirit has nothing to condemn, all to commend, in this view of the Bible, which relieves moral difficulties, exhibits a moral development of unique worth, and accords decisive importance to the moral teaching of the prophets.

(7) There can be little doubt, that the doctrine of verbal inspiration of the Scriptures helped to perpetuate ideas about God, long after they were felt to be morally objectionable. The scruples of conscience were stifled, as it seemed impious to question what was written; or recourse was sought to the view already condemned that the same moral standards were not applicable to God as to man. Candour compels us to admit that the traditional theory of inspiration often led men to do violence to their reason and conscience alike by constraining them to accept conceptions neither intelligible nor credible. The more adequate conception which we now possess both of the method and the purpose of revelation breaks these fetters on human thought about God, and allows conscience and reason their full right. We dare now to believe that nothing unworthy of ideal humanity can be ascribed to the divine reality. We can now hold with Tennyson, in his poem "Rizpah," that the heart's purest and deepest affections are our surest clue to the mystery of the works and ways of God. The doctrines of the damnation of unbaptized infants, of the foreordination of some men to perdition, of the condemnation of the heathen who have not heard the gospel, of eternal punishment in gross physical form,—all of which are an offence to conscience,—have been allowed to fall out of the actual working creed of most Christian churches. When the father's might was the right of the home, when teachers flogged learning into their scholars, it was easy to believe

in a God whose authority was arbitrary, and whose decrees were inscrutable. But as our manners and morals have become more humane, it has become impossible to enthrone tyranny in heaven. There are some persons who think that we should be the better of recovering the Puritan idea of God. But while we may long for their spirit of courage and constancy, we may be content to let their theology alone. I have no ambition to believe with Baxter, "that as the damned souls shall from hell see the saints' happiness, to increase their torments; so shall the blessed from heaven behold the wickeds' misery, to the increase of their own joy." The revelation of God's Fatherhood, for many generations obscured and distorted, is at last coming to be understood and accepted, and is becoming the regulative principle of theology. The ethical spirit has not only made this great advance in understanding the mind of Christ possible, but even inevitable. It is no less a demand of conscience that the Fatherhood of God shall be conceived as essentially a moral relation. A divine fatherhood which is a universal good-nature, indifferent to, and ignoring, moral distinctions among men is not an ethical conception. As unmoral it can only breed moral confusion and laxity. God cannot be for conscience other or less than just, righteous, holy; His absolute perfection must prescribe the conditions, and determine the limits, of His benevolence and beneficence. The maintenance, and extension, and advancement of Godlike life, that is the purpose which determines the method of the divine Fatherhood. The serious and strenuous ethical spirit forbids no less the flabby softness and the cloying sweetness of some modern representations of the love of God than the harsh severity of some of the traditional doctrines. In the truth of the *Holy Fatherhood* of God conscience demands that not less justice shall be done to the adjective than to the substantive.

(8) It is through the Son that we know the Father, and, therefore, the doctrine of the person of Christ is no less important for Christian theology than the doctrine of the nature of God. The doctrine of the divinity of Jesus has been much under debate in recent years. The Christian Church cannot accept the denial of that doctrine without the sacrifice of its inmost life. But there are certain modifications of the ecclesiastical dogmas, which not only the evangelical testimony and the apostolic interpretation demand, but which are necessary in order to exhibit the moral significance and value of the Incarnation. That the humanity of the Son of God was real, if also typical and ideal, that He subjected Himself to the conditions and limitations of man's life on earth, that He was in some matters ignorant and liable to temptation, that His development, mental, moral, spiritual, was no semblance—the recognition of these facts ethics demands. If He were omniscient, He could not be tempted; and, if He could not be tempted, His victory over sin would be morally sham and seeming. If He were not truly and fully man, sharing our burden, waging our battle enduring our darkness, we could assign no meaning, no worth to His becoming sin and a curse for us, to His tasting death for every man. An ethical conception of His salvation demands that He should be fully and truly identified with the race He came to save by a common moral history. Again I must repeat that moral good must be freely gained, and accordingly man's Saviour must Himself have been tempted in all points even as we are, yet without sin. The Christology, which lays stress on the true humanity of Jesus has a moral motive and purpose, and, therefore, has abundant moral justification. For the moral ideal can be realized for us and in us only by a personality which possesses the essential attribute of moral life, freedom to gain the good by doing the duty. But it may be objected, that to this moral demand

we are sacrificing a religious interest, that we must believe that our salvation is from and by God. But this affirmation of the true humanity does not deny the very divinity of Christ, but only serves to enrich and enlarge our conception of God. If the Incarnation, not as a physical process, as sacramentarians are fond of representing it, but as a personal experience and development, from its beginning to its close, expresses the self-sacrifice of God, divine limitation and humiliation, then it becomes the truest and best evidence of the moral perfection of God as love so holy that to save it suffers. That this doctrine, that the very divinity is manifested in the true humanity of Jesus, presents intellectual difficulties I do not deny; but that these difficulties are such as to forbid an honest and candid belief in the Incarnation cannot be maintained. Such a faith has a moral significance as well as a religious value. To conscience God cannot be more worthily presented than, as in His only begotten and well beloved Son, love incarnate even unto self-sacrifice. The sublimest and profoundest moral ideal is the Cross. How much the Incarnation means for our view of God Browning has taught us in the words—

The very God! think, Abib; dost thou think?
 So, the All-Great, were the All-Loving too—
 So, through the thunder comes a human voice
 Saying, "O heart I made, a heart beats here!
 "Face, my hands fashioned, see it in myself!
 "Thou hast no power nor may'st conceive of mine,
 "But love I gave thee, with myself to love,
 "And thou must love me who have died for thee!"

(9) In dealing with Christ's person there could not be excluded some reference to His work, for His vocation was not, as with most men, relatively accidental, but absolutely essential to His person. If we now look more closely at the doctrine of the atonement, we can in the changes of thought most of us remember trace the influence of this

potent moral factor in theology. All analogies drawn from human law-courts have gradually been recognized as morally inadequate, if not objectionable. That Christ was condemned and punished instead of us that we might go free simply on believing that He had done and suffered this for us, this is a theory of the atonement which the conscience of many men will not allow them to accept. And we must believe that they are more truly saved by Christ's grace who refuse to stifle their conscientious scruples than they who to get peace and comfort silence the inward voice. It is a genuinely ethical criticism of the traditional orthodoxy, which has made some representations of the Atonement, which the good and godly fathers held without any difficulty, impossible to their not wicked and godless sons. It must be insisted that there is a conservative evangelicalism which needlessly gives moral offence, and that there is a progressive evangelicalism which seeks to satisfy moral demands. Just because I care so much for evangelicalism, just because the Cross is the centre of my Christian thought and life, do I so deeply deplore that evangelicalism has so often made the Cross a difficulty instead of a deliverance for conscience. I do not, and I cannot believe, that we must remain without a doctrine of the Atonement, or must acquiesce in the superficial theory that the Cross has only a manward aspect, and that its efficacy is exhausted in its subjective effects, in its moral and religious impressiveness; that it is a tragic spectacle addressed to human emotions. The ethical spirit itself, which has led so many to reject the older explanations, must bring us to a more adequate interpretation than this. God's relation to man as personal must be moral. His moral authority on the one hand must be recognized, as well as man's moral submission on the other hand must be secured. While we reject analogies drawn from human law-courts, we cannot avoid the recognition of the truth, that man's

relation to God is not accidental or arbitrary, but is subject to the inexorable, ineluctable law of the Divine perfection. God's moral authority, to deserve the respect which it demands, must be shown as an absolute condemnation of, and a final execution of sentence on sin. Man's disobedience does and cannot but produce a moral reaction in God, which in punishing the violation of law reasserts His moral authority. If this be necessarily the universal and permanent moral order, in subjection to and in accordance with which man can alone realize his moral destiny, we have a moral right, nay, even a moral duty, to expect that, even in the manifestation of God's grace unto the forgiveness of sins, that moral order will not only be maintained, but will be manifested more surely and clearly than it is among the confusions of individual experience and universal history. Sin itself must be crucified, its absolute condemnation must be pronounced, and its final sentence be executed by God. With all my mind and soul I believe that God has done this in the sacrifice of His Son, which brings us salvation. On moral grounds alone we are compelled to seek a theory of the Atonement which will not less, but more adequately than all discarded theories show that God is righteous in reckoning righteous the ungodly.

(10) The doctrine of justifying faith, the human response to the Divine appeal in the Cross, must be as ethical as the doctrine of the Atonement itself. That does not mean that we are to abandon the evangelical position, and lapse to the legal; that we are to turn from faith to works. Perish even such a thought! But evangelicalism must learn to conceive faith as essentially and entirely ethical. There has been great progress in this direction. Faith is coming to be more and more generally regarded as not merely assent to a plan of salvation, but as confidence in and submission to a Saving Person. It is a misfortune that this conception of faith has often been described as *mystical* in

contrast with the older view as *legal* and *forensic*. For there is nothing more obscure and mysterious in this than in any other personal relation. There is the mental illumination and the moral influence of a perfect divine affection, progressively received and responded to in a human devotion. There is a transformation of character and conduct as a result of personal communion with a perfect personality. Love brings likeness, and affection must yield affinity for the Perfect. The life in Christ, thus conceived as a personal relation of progressive human persons to the perfect divine-human person of Jesus Christ, is ethical in method as in purpose. We do not need to abandon the firm, sure ground of the ethical, and launch out on the trackless sea of the mystical, in defining saving faith as fellowship with the living Saviour. Only if faith, as a personal union with the Perfect, carries the promise and the power of perfection, can it justify its high claims to conscience. For the grace of God, by which the faith of man is nourished, fostered, developed, is the only efficient and sufficient energy for the moral trial and task to which every Christian man is called. Conscience has been awakened to acknowledge in the present day wider responsibilities and heavier obligations than in any former age. Civic, national, nay, even universal righteousness is what the moral ideal of the present day demands. Why are the slums a shame and a sorrow to us, why do we dread the menace of the liquor trade, why did many hesitate to approve, and some not shrink from condemning the recent war? why did the massacres of Armenia, why do the atrocities of Macedonia bring a horror of great darkness over our souls? Because not only have we hearts to feel for and with our brothers and sisters, but also we have consciences, which tell us that these things need not and ought not to be. That they shall not be—this is the demand of conscience, that they shall not be—this too is the

response of Christian faith, which, claiming, enjoying, using the grace of God in Christ, is more and more seriously and bravely accepting the burden and the battle of a life in and for Christ, which, saved from sin and death, surrenders itself to be the means He may use to save all, that where sin reigned abundantly unto death, grace through righteousness may reign more abundantly unto eternal life. Thus is Christian theology in its recent progress coming to conceive more ethically the whole Christian salvation from its roots in the heart of God to its fruits in the life of man, and thus too is it becoming more practical. The present position is full of promise of a closer communion with, a clearer vision of, and a higher and wider obedience unto God in Jesus Christ, and this gain has been in large measure due to the influence of Conscience on Creed.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

*THE LIFE OF CHRIST ACCORDING TO
ST. MARK.¹*

XXIX. THE TRANSFIGURATION, IX. 2-13.

THE episode of the Transfiguration is connected by St. Mark with the previous incidents as part of the crisis which was the prologue to the Passion. After six days Jesus took with Him Peter and James and John, and took them by themselves to a high hill, probably by night, possibly moonlit, or illumined by flashes of lightning. We are not told where this hill was; six days, or more, had elapsed since Peter's confession, and had probably been spent in journeying; neither is it clear that the incidents which

¹ These studies do not profess to be an adequate historical and doctrinal account of Christ, but are an attempt to set forth the impression which St. Mark's narrative would make on a reader who had no other source of information, and was not acquainted with Christian dogmatics.

follow occurred immediately. The mention of Moses and Elijah suggests Horeb, the mountain with which the names of both were associated; and it does not seem altogether impossible that Jesus, like Elijah, in His extremity, sought some special manifestation of the presence and grace of God in the hallowed solitude of the most ancient sanctuary of Israel. But, of course, this is only a surmise; at any rate Jesus led His three disciples to some remote hillside, deliberately chosen, and reached by a special journey.

According to His custom Jesus felt that the crisis called for a season of fellowship with God, but now for the first time He sought the presence and sympathy of His disciples; the faith which discerned His Messiahship when His fortunes were desperate bound them closely to Him by new bonds of affection. The three whose company He sought had also gone with Him to the house of Jairus; they were probably chosen because they were not only leaders among the Apostles, but also associated with Jesus in closer personal friendship than their fellows. It was not St. Mark's purpose to describe the private life of Jesus, and indeed during His ministry He had little leisure from His public mission; such a life must be lonely as far as human intimacy is concerned. Yet the Prophet found amongst His disciples some with whom His relations were specially touched by personal affection. Such were the three; and one of them was Peter, who had rebuked his Master and been rebuked by Him. Jesus did not exact from His followers adulation or servile acquiescence; He could appreciate honest zeal and loyal affection, even when they led to hasty and mistaken judgments and to rough criticism of Himself. The loving confidence between Jesus and Peter was so great that He could apostrophize him as Satan, the adversary, and within a few days could ask Peter to share His most intimate fellowship with God, and Peter could accept.

There must have been much curiosity amongst the disciples as to the nocturnal absences of Jesus, which had often been followed by some unexpected action; it was after one of them that He abruptly broke off His first ministry at Capernaum, and after another that He was seen walking on the water. He may have told them that He met with God, and they, versed as they were in the language and ideas of the Old Testament, may have thought that He communed with some visible Angel of the Lord, and received from him instruction, commands and reinforcement of spiritual energy. So that, as the Three followed their Master up the hill, their nerves were strung with excited anticipation of what they were to see and hear. They reached the spot which He had chosen for His devotions, and from the analogy of the scene at Gethsemane we may suppose that He withdrew a little, but still remained within sight and near enough to be heard if He prayed aloud. As the Apostles watched Him they were startled by a change in His appearance, perhaps as the moon emerged from some obscuring cloud, or as a flash of lightning lit up the scene; His garments shone with supernatural radiance; they became "exceeding white as snow, so as no fuller on earth can white them"—whether any further change took place we are not told. They caught fragments of His speech, in which He seemed to be addressing Moses and Elijah; and they beheld an apparition of Moses and Elijah talking with Jesus. We are not told the subject or the nature of the conversation, probably because the disciples were not close enough to hear distinctly. None the less they were overcome with terror at what they saw and heard, and Peter's natural impetuosity led him to seek relief in words; not that he knew what to say, but speech was easier than silence. "Rabbi," he said, "it is good for us to be here: let us make three booths, one for Thee, one for Moses, and one for Elijah." We need

not discuss these words, since we are told that Peter did not know what to say.¹ They were the utterance of an incoherent mind, and no notice was taken of them. Next we are told that a cloud overshadowed the little group, and there came a voice out of the cloud, perhaps mingled with rolling thunder, "This is My beloved Son, hear ye Him." The testimony given to Jesus Himself at His baptism is now repeated in the hearing of the disciples. Their strange experiences rendered them prostrate with fear, but after a while they came to themselves, apparently with a sudden start, and looking round they discovered that the marvels of the night had disappeared—the cloud had passed away; Moses and Elijah had vanished; they were alone with Jesus, and their Master had resumed His ordinary appearance; the supernatural radiance no longer shone from His garments.

The narrative impresses one as having been composed from the reminiscence of an eye-witness, probably Peter, who was specially interested in his own feelings and experiences, and in what he himself said and did. The version just given involves a measure of interpretation which may be justified in a few words. The view that the incident took place by night is supported by the analogy of the seasons of prayer after the Feeding of the Five Thousand and in Gethsemane, and by the stress laid on the radiance of Jesus' garments; but as the disciples not only saw Jesus, but recognized His companions, we may assume moonlight or lightning, unless indeed Moses and Elijah also were visible by some supernatural radiance of their own. It is true that the narrative concludes by telling us that the disciples looked round and saw only Jesus and themselves, but possibly the sun had just risen.

¹ The "answered" of the E.V. in verse 5 is misleading; to the English reader it suggests a reply to words addressed to the speaker, whereas in New Testament Greek the term is also used of any speech called forth by events, circumstances, etc.

The Transfiguration is described from a subjective rather than from an objective point of view, and the description gives us the impression made upon a narrator who was quite unconscious of his subjectivity, and who did not always draw a clear distinction between subjective and objective, to whom the appearances of a vision would be as real as the actualities of everyday life. Moreover the nature and circumstances of the incident did not make for either accurate observation or exact recollection: the desolate hillside, the solitary night, the uncertain illumination of the moon or of intermittent lightning, the excited spirits of the disciples overawed by the personality of Jesus and by His mysterious audience with God and with supernatural beings—all these influences combined to produce the impression at the time, and to determine the form it assumed in the memory after mature reflection. Hence it is impossible now to go behind the narrative, and reconstruct an accurate account of the actual occurrence. Nevertheless such uncertainty does not destroy the significance of the incident. Here perhaps more than anywhere else we see Jesus inspiring awe and terror. It is one of the most marvellous features of St. Mark's narrative that the most forcible impression it leaves of Jesus is of His simple, unaffected kindness, He stands before us as the most lovable of men; and yet at the same time we are made to feel that this Friend of man is the most august and imperial figure that ever appeared upon the stage of history. His serenity kindles at times into consuming fire, and His meekness becomes charged with mystic force which daunts presumptuous selfishness. The secret of this marvel is His intimate fellowship with the Unseen; the man who has unusual supernatural dealings with the spiritual world is always an object of awe and wonder. George Eliot thus describes the impression made by Savonarola's public prayers:—

The next instant the pulpit was no longer empty. A figure covered from head to foot in black cowl and mantle had entered it, and was kneeling with bent head and with face turned away. It seemed a weary time to the eager people while the black figure knelt and the monks chanted. But the stillness was not broken, for the Frate's audiences with heaven were yet charged with electric awe for that mixed multitude, so that those who had already the will to stone him felt their arms unnerved.¹

The experience of the disciples at the Transfiguration must have been the more thrilling because they were the spectators for the first time of the solemn audience of Jesus of Nazareth with His Heavenly Father, and saw Him conversing on equal terms with the spirits of the mighty dead. It is difficult to say which alternative would furnish the more striking testimony to the spiritual power and dignity of Jesus, whether the actual appearance of Moses and Elijah, or a subjective vision due to the impression made by Jesus and His prayers on the minds of the disciples.

It is more difficult to realize what the Transfiguration meant to Jesus. No doubt He found support amidst the dark shadows that gathered thickly about His path; and the reference to Moses and Elijah shows that He was relieved of one perplexity. Jesus had been driven into antagonism to the Mosaic Law; He must have been distressed to find Himself in such a position, for He was utterly loyal to the Divine Revelation given in the Old Testament, and full of reverence for Moses; His work and teaching were based upon the Hebrew Scriptures, and apart from them His Messiahship would have been empty and meaningless; to have discredited the Old Testament would have cut the ground from under His own feet. The Transfiguration assured Him that He was the true successor and representative not only of the prophets but also of the legislators of Israel; that while He repudiated the letter of the Law, He was yet enforcing its spirit.

¹ *Romola*, ch. 62.

The disciples would be confirmed in their belief in the Messiahship of Jesus; they would expect His speedy triumph, and would be more eager than ever to proclaim His real character to the world. But they were again checked; as they came down He bade them tell no one what they had seen till the Son of Man had risen from the dead. They did not understand these words about "rising from the dead"; they were expecting not His death but His triumph; they discussed the mystery amongst themselves, but did not ask Jesus, perhaps because His manner forbade any questioning on that point, or perhaps because in their inmost hearts they feared lest His answer should strike a death-blow to their hopes. Their conversation soon returned to the great topic which occupied most of their thoughts, the Messiahship of Jesus. Some one raised a difficulty suggested by current ideas, the coming of the Messiah must be preceded by the re-appearance of Elijah as the forerunner. Apparently this condition had not been fulfilled unless indeed the vision they had just seen was its fulfilment, and yet so transient a visit to earth could scarcely be all that Malachi intended when he said: "I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord: and he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse." This difficulty they did not hesitate to refer to Jesus, "The scribes say that Elijah must first come." It is curious that there is no explicit reference to the recent vision either in the disciples' question or in Jesus' answer, "Truly Elijah cometh first and restoreth all things, and how it is written of the Son of Man that He must suffer many things and be set at nought; but I say unto you, that Elijah has indeed come, and they have done to him as they pleased, as it is written of him." Jesus again attempts to fix their

thoughts on the coming tragedy which they were so anxious to ignore; yet He does not refuse to meet their difficulty. Elijah had come again in John the Baptist.¹ The passage is important as illustrating the method of interpretation which Jesus used for the Old Testament. Its predictions might be fulfilled in a very elastic sense; the definite statement that Elijah should come again is fulfilled by the coming of John the Baptist in the spirit and power of Elijah; John the Baptist being, as we should say, a second Elijah.

XXX. THE HEALING OF THE DEMONIAK BOY, IX. 14-29.

After leaving the scene of the Transfiguration, Jesus and His three companions rejoined the rest of the disciples. St. Mark's narrative is too fragmentary to allow us to assume that they were close by at the foot of the hill waiting for Jesus. The next incident took place in a populous district, perhaps at some considerable distance. There is nothing to indicate the exact locality, but it was probably in Northern Palestine. We are told that the people were astonished when He appeared, probably because they did not expect Him; it is also possible that at this time His countenance and manner expressed a certain spiritual exaltation inspired by the experiences He had passed through, and the high and tragic resolution He had taken. He found the remaining disciples in the midst of a thronging crowd, engaged in unequal controversy with certain scribes. When Jesus appeared upon the scene, the whole multitude, both the disputants and their audience, ran to Him and greeted Him. He inquired as to the subject of the dispute between the two parties. Apparently neither was eager to reply, but one of the crowd

¹ As in Mark i. 2ff. the "messenger" of Malachi iii. 1 is identified with John the Baptist, it is clear that here also the Evangelist intends us to understand that the Baptist is referred to.

answered that he had brought to Jesus his son, who was afflicted by a dumb spirit, which continually threw him into convulsions. Not finding Jesus, he had sought help from the disciples, but they had not been able to cast out the evil spirit. It was quite natural to seek such relief from the disciples. When they were sent out two by two, it was part of their mission to cast out devils, and apparently they had been successful. Now there were nine of them together, and they could not cast out the demon. Certain scribes, who happened to be present, taunted the disciples with their failure; they and their Master were alike impostors. An angry dispute arose; the disciples would retort that if only Jesus were there, they would soon see that He could cast out demons. And now here He was, in the very nick of time, confronted with a test case. Would He be equal to the occasion?

At the Transfiguration He had received the assurance that His work was the legitimate development of that of Moses and Elijah in spite of His repudiation of the ceremonial law. Now the whole question seemed to be reopened. He found His disciples in fierce controversy with the scribes, who claimed to be the representatives of Moses, staking His reputation on His power to work a miracle, although He had never encouraged them to ground their faith on His mighty works. These were the men who were to carry on His work after He was gone. Even now they misunderstood Him terribly, and there was so little time left for Him to be with them. "O unbelieving generation," He cried, "how long shall I be with you, how long shall I suffer you?" Yet now as ever the appeal of suffering was irresistible to Jesus, and He added, "Bring him to Me." The boy was brought, and as in other cases the excitement caused an acute attack of the malady. The crowd, disciples, scribes, the unhappy father, and the curious spectators, watched to see what Jesus would do. And He, as His

manner was, calm, deliberate, master of Himself and of the situation, asked how long the boy had suffered, and the father answered, "from a child," and dwelt upon the danger and distress that the trouble had brought upon them. Then he grew impatient with the Healer's quiet inactivity, and doubtful of His power to heal. "If Thou canst do anything," he cried, "pity us and help us." Jesus took him up, "'If thou canst . . .'! All things are possible to him that believeth." The hindrance did not lie with Jesus, but with the father's lack of faith. "Sir," he cried out with tears, "I do believe, help Thou mine unbelief." Still it seems Jesus hesitated, and it was not till He observed the growing numbers and increasing excitement of the crowd that He bade the unclean spirit come out of the boy, and never enter into him again. Then with cries and convulsions the evil spirit came out, leaving the boy apparently dead, but Jesus took him by the hand and raised him up, and he recovered.

When Jesus and His disciples were quiet together afterwards, they asked Him why they had failed in what they had been able to accomplish at other times. Jesus told them that such cures could only be wrought by prayer. The miraculous powers which He possessed Himself and imparted to His disciples, were no mere mechanical magic. They depended not only on the faith of those who were helped, but also on the spiritual condition of the healer, the intimacy of His fellowship with God.

W. H. BENNETT.

*THE PERMANENT ELEMENTS OF RELIGION.*¹

THERE are many human institutions which are known to have existed before their true purpose was ascertained. Having originated instinctively they were carried on long before they attracted attention and became the subject of investigation ; and not in every case was their real purpose obvious or certain till after many theories about it had been demonstrated to be false. Only when the true purpose of the institution is discovered is it possible by improvement to multiply its usefulness.

In this matter the difference between man and the other animals is striking. They have their instincts, leading them to perform a variety of operations, often subtle and complicated ; but experiment has shown that they are performed automatically and mechanically, the performer having no knowledge whatever of the result which his operation produces. The operation is therefore carried on as before when the circumstances are so altered that it frustrates the result which in ordinary cases it tends to realize. The question whether even a series of generations causes the operation to be conducted with greater skill is one on which the truth cannot be easily obtained. What is certain is that improvement is not due to the exercise of thought compassing a particular end, and speculating on the means by which it can be effected.

Man, on the other hand, in these, as in other cases, finds out what nature means, and improves thereon. At some period or other he discovered how the power of articulation could be utilized for the expression of ideas, and he invented language, and improved it from one stage to another, till it could be written, till it could be printed, till it could be telephoned, till it could be typed. The cries of the

¹ Murtle Lecture, Aberdeen, December, 1903.

beasts remain where nature left them, or in the course of many generations acquire some trifling differentiation.

Religious ceremonies of one sort or another would appear to have existed long before there was speculation on their purpose and meaning : and the earliest assumption on the subject was that their purpose was to produce for the worshipper what he wanted, and avert from him what he disliked. Tablets innumerable dating from the time when writing began record the services which gods have performed, and for which they were worshipped : the procuring of food, of wealth, of children, of victory : the accomplishing of whatever the worshipper desired to be accomplished. And the belief that worship of the right sort procured these things, whereas worship of a wrong kind kept them away, was possibly the origin, and in any case the justification of religious persecution. If the worship of Baal really caused the failure of rain for three years, Elijah's massacre of the priests of Baal had some obvious justification. If the presence of heretics in England was what caused Queen Mary to be childless, there was some justification for the introduction of the Inquisition. Where the misconduct of individuals was thought to bring misfortunes on the whole community, the community was justified in getting rid of those individuals, and taking steps to deter others from joining their ranks.

In the awakening of mankind we can trace the gradual abandonment of this theory in favour of another. It was discovered that the relation of personal or national prosperity to piety was one that could not be ascertained ; indeed the doctrine that the pious were not prosperous, but were more liable to misfortune than other men gained ground. One way of dealing with this difficulty was to assign things new values : to hold that the goods of this world for which the gods were ordinarily supplicated were bad things, and that poverty, hunger, disease, which most

men abhorred, were really Divine favours ; but more usually the difficulty was evaded by the doctrine of a future life, in which the pious would be compensated for that which they had forfeited here ; and since in that future life comforts would be permanent, whereas here they were transitory, the balance would really come right: for the amount forfeited would bear no proportion to that which would eventually be acquired. Our present afflictions are unworthy of consideration when compared with the glory that is to be revealed hereafter. And this solution has been found more satisfactory and more potent than the other, though the other is rarely quite abandoned.

Of course this theory, like all others, must eventually depend on the knowledge that can be obtained by correct methods concerning man's ultimate destiny. Even now inquiries into that matter are rarely conducted by sober students ; they suppose that there is no means of ascertaining anything about it. It is hard to say whether the elaborate work on the Survival of Human Personality that has recently caused so much discussion will be presently forgotten, or be regarded as the beginning of a science, the first step in a study which may enlarge human knowledge, and help man to see clearly where preceding generations were in the dark. It is hard to say ; but of this we may be sure, that the method illustrated in those volumes is the only method by which knowledge, if it is to be obtained at all, will be procured. The evidence of the return to earth of discarnate spirits may be all delusive, every supposed appearance of the sort may be due to mystification or delusion ; but the examination of the supposed occurrences appears to be the only avenue by which there is even a possibility of ascertaining anything about the existence of discarnate spirits and their destiny. If any are genuine, then from them analogous histories in our sacred books can be explained and estimated ; if all are delusive, then we are

scarcely at liberty to assign greater external value to Biblical narratives of the sort. It must be confessed, however, that the results of the book mentioned, estimating them at their highest, give little confirmation of the religious value of the doctrine of the survival of human personality. The discarnate spirit would appear hence to be almost as poor a reminder of the living man as is the corpse of the living body. Contrary to what we should have expected, the earthly passions would not appear to be extinguished at the parting of the spirit from the flesh. Of any connexion between the conduct or the beliefs of the human being in life and the condition of his spirit after the separation there would appear to be little trace. It seems, however, as if the author of this book had got his idea of the spirit world from old Homer, and had read the Homeric doctrine into the confessions which he took such pains to collect and examine. Although, then, it is conceivable that the pursuit of the inquiry in which that book takes the lead may produce some extension of our knowledge of human nature and its destiny, it is hardly likely that such extension will have more effect upon religion than say advanced knowledge of physiology has on morals. Nature here, as elsewhere, will be found to give rough material on which the human artisan must work.

Hence we are driven to seek the permanent elements of religion in the needs which it fulfils in human society: as learned not from any *a priori* assumptions, but from a study of its actual effects. And the main needs which it satisfies are three.

First, the ornamentation of life. Just as it is the practice of civilized nations to conceal all the body but the face and hands, so the sense of what is becoming and beautiful forces them to conceal under ornament the naked facts of human existence, as nature gives them. Science and taste pursue their functions independently, without rivalry, with-

out mutual interference; at times, indeed, there is even co-operation between the two. Penetration into nature's workshop is not forbidden: but the sense of what is comely and decent makes us keep the door ordinarily shut. For the unaesthetic realities connected with the origin and termination of human existence, and the mode whereby it is sustained, religion substitutes an account that suits the aspiration after what is comely and beautiful. "When a man is dead he shall inherit creeping things, beasts, and worms"—that is the natural account. "Father, in Thy gracious keeping leave we now Thy servant sleeping." "Christ the Lord shall guard them well, He who died for their release"—is what religion substitutes for the painful and unaesthetic reality.

The value of religion, therefore, as beautifying human life is entirely independent of the objective value of what it teaches. Art can render valueless materials valuable by what it adds to them; but it does not therefore follow that the materials on which it is exercised are otherwise valueless. Yet many a difference has been occasioned by the failure to recognize the fact that in the concealment of the ugliness of nature religion does something of consequence, independently of the question whether her statements are historically and objectively true. The person into whose life the ceremonies of religion enter has something that is of value apart from the question whether the ceremonies affect anything in nature. The history of religion shows us that many races believed the question of the mode of burial to have a potent effect on the fate of the corpse, or of the spirit who formerly inhabited it; if funeral rites have a place of prime importance in many ancient systems, it is because much was thought to depend on their proper execution. From those superstitions we have been emancipated by science and philosophy: but that emancipation has not rendered the religious ceremonies that attend the

last disposal of the body less desirable or less desired.

The different religions have not always been in precise agreement concerning the portions of life which it was their function to beautify: but on the whole a comparison of different rituals makes it appear that it is in general the functions which man shares with the brutes which religion would cover with its glamour, differentiating him thereby from them. That which is haphazard in their case, their want of individual value, is concealed in his by a system which gives each individual personal importance, and brings him into direct connexion with the power of which nature is the expression or the work. At times doubtless the adornment of life has taken the form not only of differentiating man from the beasts, but still more of differentiating him from his like: of perpetuating castes and peculiar peoples, and those other divisions which have so much arrested human progress. But when the last of these has been abolished and forgotten, there will still be enough in his community with the lower creation to require concealment. And this can only be effected by the doctrine that he has a different beginning and a different destination from them.

To the ornamentation of life belong those feasts and fasts in which it would appear that physiological reasons require that vent should at certain seasons of the year be given to certain human emotions. For their expression some ostensible cause is required, and religious occasions are more suitable than any others, because they can be universal, and permanent, and personal. Were we to make the day of national rejoicing the anniversary of Waterloo, or the day of national mourning the commemoration of some defeat, we should thereby be perpetuating enmities which had better be forgotten than kept alive. But even the commemoration of material benefits or disasters which are unconnected with national animosities would be inade-

quate, since such events are of passing importance, and the memory of each triumph of discovery is speedily obscured by some fresh triumph : whereas of disasters, even the most considerable, the effect passes quickly away. But religion can provide occasions for rejoicing and for mourning which, while they unite the population of whole countries, and even of hostile countries, also appeal to each individual, who as a member of the human race has his share in the benefit or in the disaster. The Christian system in its fasts and feasts, making each person definitely responsible for the disasters which the former commemorate, and personally sharing in the blessings of which the latter celebrate the bestowal, in making both universal in character and permanent in effect, has satisfied the need for occasions of mourning and rejoicing better than any rival system ; but in those other systems we can often trace a tendency towards universalism, when the original occasions were national and particular. To the philosopher of Islam the weird and uncouth ceremonial of the Pilgrimage, of which the origin has long been forgotten, is transformed into a rehearsal of man's final meeting with his Maker, clad in a winding sheet, weaned from all bodily enjoyments, having deposited all earthly excrescences. The celebration of a paschal feast, commemorating the escape from bondage and acquisition of a country by a people who had lost the country and sunk again into bondage might seem a mockery till for each term in the proposition a spiritual equivalent could be substituted ; the Paschal Feast being thus made to commemorate an escape to be followed by no return into captivity ; the acquisition of a country which no invader could seize ; the triumph over the enemy of the human race to whose assaults each member of it is exposed. "It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body," might serve as the description of many an institution which has formed part of a religion. For that deliverance of remote

ancestors from a temporary trouble the clarification of concepts has substituted a cause for rejoicing which each person who enters the spiritual community can appropriate to himself; the ceremonies which were originally commemorative of some event of passing importance, of which they served as the historical record, come to be symbolic of an experience that each individual has undergone, or of a future that he certainly awaits; to be a foretaste or sample of something infinitely greater which is in store for him, and all who are members with him, of a community which is limited by no accidents of birth, by no boundaries of space or time.

The second of the main purposes of religion is that of education and reform. And the reason for the need of it in education seems to lie mainly in two facts. One is that man leads a double life—an inner and an outer, the second being the expression of the first; and for the moralizing of the human being it is of the highest importance that the inner life should be moralized, and not only its outer expression made to conform to certain rules. Now over the inner man the parent and schoolmaster have in no case complete, in many cases most imperfect control. Their power of punishing and keeping in order is confined to external acts. But the religious education teaches the pupil of the existence of a being whose power is not thus bounded, and within whose ken all the internal processes of the mind and heart are as completely as are the external and visible acts; and who therefore can both know and punish where the ordinary human governor cannot take cognizance. With the religious education then both parts of human life and action are under surveillance; and motives are given leading to the moralizing of the interior as well as the exterior man.

The highest system of morality have all urged the need of having the inside of the vessel clean; not condemning

secrecy, but urging that the secrets should be of a sort which if known would raise a man's estimation instead of lowering it. But this can scarcely be enforced without the doctrine of one who seeth in secret, whether the promise that for secret merits there will be open reward be added or not. To that form of morality which consists in acting rightly independently of reputation, and without regard to any consequences here or hereafter, the road seems invariably to lie through the belief that secret acts and secret intentions are known and rightly appraised by God, whether man know anything of them or nothing. Through that discipline there is introduced the possibility of advancing beyond the morality of the time, a man being thus accustomed to rely on a weightier approval for his conduct than that which the opinion of his fellows furnishes. But though this power of advance is given to but few, the belief in the unseen witness in any case prevents good conduct from being merely conterminous with external behaviour. The desire to shun disapproval, if not to avoid punishment, can be made to dominate the whole process of thinking and acting.

The second fact is the need for an authority, to which reference can be made when the reason for an order is demanded. The actual course of reasoning whereby the necessity for a rule has been arrived at, can often from its nature only be communicated to mature intelligences, and the need for its observance comes long before maturity is attained, not only in the individual, but often even in the community. The ascription of a series of orders to a superhuman authority provides an immediate and for a time satisfactory answer to any questions that may arise as to the reason for a prescription. The effectiveness of authority at certain stages of the progress of both individuals and communities need not be dwelt on; and indeed the possession of a sacred book containing authoritative

rules for life and conduct has in several instances caused a religion to triumph over others, that had no such provision. The assumption that the rule is authoritative, and the possibility of indicating without hesitation its source, are valuable aids for dealing with minds at the stage when simple expedients are required, and when certainty and simplicity are thought to be characteristic of truth. The metaphysical difficulties which attend on such expedients are in neither case appreciated before a certain degree of maturity renders the mind more capable of understanding the relation of morals to the requirements of human society.

For the purpose of reformation the need of religion seems to vary somewhat in character according as the offence committed is one which society can or cannot punish. Whole series of offences are left unpunished by almost any code, and there is reason for believing that of those which the law does punish, only a certain number ever come to light in such a way as to bring the culprit within the reach of the law. But in these cases the religious teacher can assure the criminal that his misdeeds neither remain unnoticed, nor will eventually escape punishment. Those who have to deal as missionaries with persons suspected of such misconduct, can as a rule ill spare the weapon which is furnished by the doctrine of another life; but the doctrine that Divine vengeance is to be exacted in this life, is not altogether contradicted by experience, and the terrors of the future only render this threat more potent. Only without religious teaching, without the possibility of preaching the doctrine that the world is morally governed, that an unseen power potent, where the ordinary government is weak or helpless, is interested in human conduct, and in setting right the balance when it is disturbed, the reform of persons in whom the moral sense is weak, is probably impracticable.

Appearance in such cases suggests that there is impunity for wrong-doing, when it can either escape notice, or is of a sort which the law does not undertake to punish; the religious teacher can give the most positive assurance that there is nothing of the sort. The same terror, then, which deters men from crimes of which the punishment is obvious and certain, is thus employed to deter them from those of which the punishment is not apparent.

But where offences are actually punished by society, it would seem that the need for religion is different. For society does not forgive. The constant raising of the standard of conduct that is characteristic of progressive communities renders it inevitable that where they take cognizance of misdeeds, that cognizance should leave an indelible stigma, which no length of time can efface. Hence the moral progress of a community leads to a diminution of the motive for reformation in those who have sinned, whereas the interest of the community demands that the motives for reform should be strong. In these cases, then, the importance of religious teaching is not in what it threatens, but in what it promises. Sins that cannot be forgiven or forgotten by man are forgiven by God. Complete reinstatement into the society of the innocent and stainless which cannot be effected in the world of men, is promised in another world to those who repent. Operating in the former case by the agency of fear, in this case religion inspires men with hope.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

(To be continued.)

*THE FLAVIAN PERSECUTION IN THE PROVINCE
OF ASIA.*

THE shadow of the Roman Empire broods over the whole of the Apocalypse. Not merely are the Empire and the Emperors and the Imperial city introduced explicitly and by more or less clear descriptions among the figures that bulk most largely in the Visions, an even more important, though less apparent, feature of the book is that many incidental expressions would be taken by the Asian readers as referring to the Empire. Their minds were filled with the greatness, the majesty, the all-powerful and irresistible character of the Roman rule; and, with this thought in their minds, they inevitably interpreted every allusion to worldly dignity and might as referring to Rome, unless it were at the outset indicated by some marked feature as not Roman. One such exception is the Horseman of vi. 1, who rides forth accompanied by Bloodshed, Scarcity and Pestilence: he is marked forthwith by the bow that he carries as the Parthian terror, which always loomed on the eastern horizon as the possible source of an invasion with its concomitant trials.

Those incidental allusions can be brought out only by a detailed study and scrutiny of the Apocalypse, sentence by sentence. But it will facilitate the understanding of the Seven Letters to notice here briefly the chief figures under which the power of Rome appears in the Apocalypse. Some of these are quite correctly explained by most modern commentators; but one at least is still rather

obscure. Almost every interpreter rightly explains the Dragon of xii. 3 ff., the Beast of xiii. 1 ff., and the Woman of xvii. 3 ff.; but the monster in xiii. 18 ff. is not quite properly explained, and this is the one that most intimately concerns the purpose of the present series of studies.

The Dragon of xii. 1, the supreme power of evil, acts through the force of the Empire, when he waited to *devour the child of the Woman* and *persecuted the Woman* and proceeded to *make war on the rest of her seed*; and his heads and his horns are the Imperial instruments by whom he carries on war and persecution. The Beast of xiii. 1, with his ten diademed horns and the blasphemous names on his seven heads, is the Imperial government with its diademed Emperors and its temples dedicated to human beings blasphemously styled by Divine names.

The Woman of xvii. 1, sitting on a scarlet-coloured beast with seven heads and ten horns and names of blasphemy, decked in splendour and lapped in luxury and *drunk with the blood of the saints and the blood of the martyrs*, is the Imperial city, which attracted to her allurements and her pomp *the kings of the nations*, the rich and distinguished men from all parts of the civilized world. "Kings" was a term often applied in the social speech of that period to the rich and luxurious. There were also the kings of client states in Asia Minor and Syria, one of whom was in Rome in A.D. 69, and fought for Otho in the Civil War.

To Rome go the saints and martyrs to be tormented, that the woman and her guests may be amused on festivals and State occasions. She sits upon the Imperial monster, the beast with its heads and its horns and its blasphemous names and its purple or scarlet hue (for the ancient names of colours pass into one another with little distinction), because Rome had been raised higher than ever before by the Imperial government. Yet the same Beast and the ten horns,

by which she is exalted so high, *shall hate her, and shall make her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh, and shall burn her utterly with fire*: for the Emperors were no true friends to Rome, they feared it, and therefore hated it, curtailed its liberties, deprived it of all its power, murdered its citizens and all its leading men, wished (like Caligula) that the whole Roman People had one single neck, and (like Nero) burned the city to the ground.

In a more veiled and yet a clearly marked way the Province Asia appears as a figure in the Vision. It must be understood, however, what "the Province" was in the Roman system and the popular conception. The Province was not a tract of land subjected to Rome: as a definite tract or division of the earth "Asia" had no existence except in the sense of the whole vast continent, which is still known under that name. A "Province" to the Roman mind meant literally "a sphere of duty," and was an administrative, not a geographical, fact: the Province of a magistrate might be the stating of law in Rome, or the superintendence of a great road, or the administration of a region or district of the world, but it was not and could not be (except in a loose and derivative way) a tract of country. The Province was the aspect in which Rome manifested itself to the people of Asia; and conversely the Province was the form under which the people of Asia constituted a part of the Empire. Rome stood before the Asians in two points of view.

In the first place the Province of Asia was the entire circle of administrative duties connected with that division of the Empire, which stood before the minds of the people of Asia (and among them of the writer of the Apocalypse) as the whole body of officials, who conducted the administration, especially the Senate in Rome acting through its chosen agent on the spot, the individual Senator whom the rest of the Senate delegated to repre-

sent it and to administer its power in Asia for the period of a year, residing in official state as Proconsul in the capital or making his official progress through the principal cities.

In the second place the Province was the whole circle of religious duties and rites which constituted the ideal bond of unity holding the people of Asia together as a part of the Imperial realm ; and this ritual was expressed to the Asian mind by the representative priests, constituting the Commune (or, as it might almost be called, the Parliament) of Asia : the one representative body that spoke for the " Nation," i. e., the Province, Asia.

Again, the Province was the status which a certain body of persons and cities had in the Roman Empire. They had a place and privilege in the Empire as members of the Province, and their rights and duties were determined by the " Law of the Province," which was settled when the Province was admitted. A Phrygian did not occupy a place in the Empire as a Phrygian, but as an Asian or a Galatian. A " Phrygian " was a member of a foreign conquered race. An Asian or a Galatian was a unit in the Roman population, with less privileges indeed than a Roman Citizen, but still honoured with certain duties and rights. His rights and duties were partly civil and partly religious : as an Asian he must both act and feel as part of the Empire, he must do certain duties and feel certain emotions of loyalty and patriotism : loyalty and patriotism were expressed through the Provincial religion, the State worship of the majesty of Rome and the Emperor.

The Province of Asia in its double aspect of civil and religious administration, the Proconsul and the Commune, is symbolized by the monster described xiii. 11 ff. This monster *had two horns* corresponding to this double aspect ; and it was *like unto a lamb*, for Asia was a peaceful

country, where no army was needed. Yet *it spake as a dragon*, for the power of Rome expressed itself quite as sternly and haughtily, when it was unsupported by troops, as it did when it spoke through the mouth of a general at the head of an army.

The monster *exerciseth all the authority of the first Beast in his sight*; for the provincial administration exercised the full authority of the Roman Empire, delegated to the Proconsul for his year of office.

It maketh the earth and all that dwell therein to worship the first Beast, for the provincial administration organized the State religion of the Emperors. The Imperial regulation that all loyal subjects must conform to the State religion and take part in the Imperial ritual, was carried out according to the regulations framed by the Commune, which arranged the ritual, superintended and directed its performance, ordered the building of temples, and the erection of statues, fixed the holidays and festivals, and so on—*saying to them that dwell on the earth that they should make an image to the Beast*.

At this point occurs a remarkable series of statements, constituting the one contemporary account of the Flavian persecution of the Christians in Asia. They are to the effect that the Commune attempted to prove the truth and power of the Imperial religion by means of miracles and wonders: the monster "*doeth great signs, that he should even make fire to come down out of heaven upon the earth in the sight of men; and he deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by reason of the signs which it was given him to do in the sight of the Beast; saying to them that dwell on the earth that they should make an image to the Beast. And it was given him to give breath to the statue of the Beast, that the statue of the Beast should both speak and cause that as many as should not worship the statue of the Beast should be killed.*" The last statement is familiar to us; it is not directly

attested for the Flavian period by any pagan authorities, but it is proved by the concurrent testimony of Christian authorities, and corroborated by known historical facts, and by the interpretation which Trajan stated about twenty-five years later of the principles of Imperial procedure in this department. It is simply the straightforward enunciation of the rule as to the kind of trial that should be given to those who were accused of Christianity. The accused were required to prove their loyalty by performing an act of religious worship of the statue of the Emperor, which (as Pliny mentioned to Trajan) was brought into court in readiness for the test: if they performed the ritual, they were acquitted and dismissed: if they refused to perform it, they were condemned to death. No other proof was sought; no investigation was made; no accusation of any specific crime or misdeed was made; as had been the case in the persecution of Nero, which is described by Tacitus. That short and simple procedure was legal, prescribed by Imperial instructions, and complete.

No scholar now doubts that the account given so far in these words of the Apocalypse represents accurately the procedure in the Flavian persecution. Criticism for a time attempted to discredit the unanimous Christian testimony, because it was unsupported by direct pagan testimony; and signally failed. The attempt is abandoned now.

Quite correct also is the statement that "the Province" ordered the inhabitants of Asia to make a statue in honour of the Beast. The Commune of Asia ordered the construction of statues of the Imperial gods, and especially the statue of the Divine Augustus in the temple at Pergamum.

But the other statements in this remarkable passage are entirely uncorroborated, nor does any even indirect evidence support them. It is nowhere said or hinted, except here, that the State cult in Asia, the most educated part of the Empire, recommended itself by tricks and pseudo-miracles,

such as bringing down fire from heaven, or making the image of the Emperor speak. With regard to these statements we are reduced to mere general presumptions and estimate of probabilities.

Are we then to discredit them as inventions, or as mere vague and empty repetitions of traditional apocalyptic ideas and images? By no means. This is the one contemporary account that has been preserved of the Flavian procedure: the one solitary account of the methods practised at that time by the Commune of Asia in recommending and establishing the State religion. It is thoroughly uncritical to accept from this account two details, which are known from other sources to be absolutely and strikingly true, and to dismiss the rest as untrue, because they are neither corroborated nor contradicted by other authorities. This account stands alone: there is no other authority: it is corroborated indirectly in the main facts. The accessory details, therefore, are probably true: they are not in themselves unlikely, though it is rather a shock to us to find that such conduct is attributed to the Commune in that highly civilized age—highly civilized in many respects, but in some both decadent and barbarous.

It must also be remembered that the people of the Province Asia were not all equally educated and civilized: many of them had no Greek education, but were sunk in ignorance and the grossest Oriental superstition. There is no good reason apparent why this contemporary account should be disbelieved; and we must accept it, and conclude that the attempt was made under the authority of the Commune, by one or more of its delegates in charge of the various temples and the ritual practised at them, to impress the populace with the might of the Imperial divinity by showing signs and miracles, by causing fire to burst forth without apparent cause, and declaring that it came down from heaven, and by causing speech to seem to issue from

the statue in the temple. The writer accepts those signs as having really occurred. The monster was permitted by God to perform those marvels, and to delude men for a time. None of the details which this contemporary account mentions is incredible or even improbable. A Roman Proconsul in Cyprus had a Magian as his friend and teacher in science : the Magian probably showed him the known sign of spontaneous fire bursting forth at his orders. In a Roman Colony at Philippi a ventriloquist, a slave girl, earned large sums for her owners by fortune-telling (Acts xvi. 16) : why should not ventriloquism be employed in Asia in the service of an Imperial temple at this time of intense excitement among persecuted and persecutors alike.

It is not necessary to suppose that the Commune of Asia encouraged and practised everywhere such methods. It would be sufficient justification for the statements in this passage, if the methods were practised by any of its official representatives in any of the Asian temples of the Imperial religion, without condemnation from the Commune. There is no reason to think that the shrine of the Sibyl at Thyatira was alien to such impostures, or that the people in Ephesus who were impressed by the magical powers of the sons of Sceva (Acts xix. 13 f.) and duped by other fraudulent exhibitors, were unlikely to be taken in by such arts when officially practised.

That these marvels and signs were connected more particularly with one individual, and not so much with the Commune as a body, is suggested by the only other reference to them, viz. xix. 20, when *the Beast and the kings of the earth and their armies gathered together to make war against Him that sat upon the horse and against His army ; and the Beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought the signs in his sight, wherewith he deceived them that had received the mark of the Beast and them that worshipped his image.* We must understand that these words refer to

some definite person, who exercised great influence in some part of Asia, and was the leading spirit in performing the marvels and signs : he is as real as the prophetess of Thyatira, ii. 20. He had been prominent in deceiving the people for the benefit of the Imperial government, and is associated with its approaching destruction. This association in ruin would be all the more telling, if the prophet had visited Rome and been received by some of the Flavian Emperors.

A personage like Apollonius of Tyana would suit well the allusions in the Apocalypse. He lived and exercised great influence in Asia, especially at Ephesus, where after his death he enjoyed a special cult as "the averter of evil" (Alexikakos), because he had taught the city how to free itself from a pestilence by detecting the human form, in which the pest was stalking about in their midst, and putting to death the wretched old man on whom he fixed the guilt.

Apollonius had the general reputation of a magician. He had been well received in Rome, and was the friend of Vespasian, Titus and Nerva. His biographer, Philostratus, defends him from the charge of magic, but represents him as a worker of signs and wonders ; and it must be remembered that St. John does not regard the prophet as an impostor, but as one to whom *it was given to perform marvels*. Philostratus, it is true, does not represent him as an upholder of the Imperial cultus, and rather emphasizes his opposition to Domitian ; but the aim of the biographer is not to give an exact history of Apollonius as he was, but to place an ideal picture before the eyes of the world. There is every reason to think that a man like Apollonius would use all his influence in favour of Vespasian and Titus, and no reason to think that he would discountenance or be unwilling to promote the Imperial cultus. While he was opposed to Domitian, it does not appear that the mutual dislike had come to a head early in

the reign of that Emperor, when according to our view the Apocalypse was conceived, though Philostratus represents Apollonius as foreseeing everything and knowing intuitively the character of every man.

It seems, then, quite possible that Apollonius may actually be meant by this prophet associated with the Beast; but, even if that be not correct, yet it is certain that there were other magicians and workers of wonders in the Asian cities; and it is in no way improbable that one of them may have been employed as an agent, even as a high-priest, of the Imperial religion. The over-stimulated, cultured and yet morbid society of the great cities of Asia Minor furnished a fertile soil for the development of such soothsayers, fortune-tellers and dealers in magic: the account which Lucian gives of Alexander of Abonoteichos in Paphlagonia may be taken as a good example in the second century. The existence of many such impostors in the Province Asia during the first century is attested, not merely by the passages quoted above from the Acts, but also by an incident recorded by Philostratus in the biography of Apollonius, vii. 41. The Asian cities by the Hellespont, dreading the recurrence of earthquakes, contributed ten talents to certain Egyptian and Chaldæan soothsayers for a great sacrifice to avert the danger. Apollonius encountered and drove away the impostors—the circumstances of the contest are not recorded—discovered the reason why Earth and Sea were angry, offered the proper expiatory sacrifices, averted the danger at a small expense, and the earth stood unmoved.

The monster, who stands for the Province, is described as *coming up out of the earth*. He is contrasted with the Beast which *came up out of the sea*. They are thus described as native and as foreign: the one belongs to the same land as the readers of the Apocalypse, the other comes from across the sea, and seems to rise out of the sea

as it comes. This form of expression was usual, both in language and in art. Foreign products and manufactures were described as "of the sea" (*θαλάσσια*): we use "sea-borne" in the same sense: the goddess who came in with the Phœnicians, as patroness and protectress of the Sidonian ships, was represented as "rising from the sea." Beings native to the country, or closely connected with the earth, were represented in art as reclining on the ground or emerging with only half their figure out of the ground.

Thus the Beast was marked clearly to the readers as having a home beyond the sea, while the monster was closely connected with their own soil, and had its home in their own country.

The monster causeth all, the small and the great, and the rich and the poor, and the free and the bond, that there be given them a mark on their right hand or upon their forehead; and that no man should be able to buy or to sell, save he that hath the mark, the name of the Beast or the number of his name.

This refers to some unknown, but (as will be shown) not in itself improbable attempt, either through official regulation or informal "boycott," to injure the Asian Christians by preventing dealings with traders and shopkeepers who had not proved their loyalty to the Emperor. That such an attempt may have been made in the Flavian persecution seems quite possible. It is not described by St. John as an Imperial, but only as a provincial regulation; now it is absolutely irreconcilable with the principles of Roman administration that the Proconsul should have issued any order of the kind except with Imperial authorization; therefore we must regard this as a recommendation originating from the Commune of Asia. The Commune would have no authority to issue a command or law; but it might signalize its devotion to the Emperor by recommending that the disloyal should be discountenanced by the

loyal, and that all loyal subjects should try to restrict their custom to those who were of proved loyalty. Such a recommendation might be made by a devoted and courtly body like the Commune; and it was legal to do this, because all who refused to engage in the public worship of the Emperors were proscribed by Imperial act as traitors and outlaws, possessing no rights.

Only some enactment of this kind seems adequate to explain this remarkable statement of xiii. 16 f. In a very interesting section of his *Biblical Studies*, p. 241 f., Dr. Deissmann describes the official stamp impressed on legal deeds recording and registering the sale of property; and maintains that this whole passage takes its origin from the custom of marking with the Imperial stamp all records of sale. This seems an inadequate explanation. The mark of the Beast was a preliminary condition, and none who wanted it were admitted to business transactions. But the official stamp was merely the concomitant guarantee of legality; it was devoid of religious character; and there was no reason why it should not be used by Christians as freely as by pagans.

That the mark of the Beast must be impressed in the right hand or the forehead is a detail which remains obscure; we know too little to explain it with confidence. If it had been called simply the mark on the forehead, it might be regarded as the public proof of loyalty by performance of the ritual: this overt, public proof might be symbolically called "a mark on the forehead." But the mention of an alternative place for the mark shows that more wide-reaching explanation is needed. The proof of loyalty might be made in two ways; both were patent and public; they are symbolically described as the mark on the right hand or on the forehead; without one or the other no one was to be dealt with by the loyal provincials.

That something like a "boycott" might be attempted in

the fervour of loyalty and of hatred for the disloyal Christians seems not impossible. That "strikes" occurred in the Asian cities seems established by an inscription of Magnesia; and where "strikes" occur, an attempted "boycott" seems also possible. But the character attributed to this mark of the Beast extends far beyond the operation of a mere restriction on trading transactions. It must be remembered that the age was the extremest and worst period of "delation," i.e. of prosecution by volunteer accusers on charges of treason. The most trifling or the most serious actions were alike liable to be twisted into acts of personal disrespect to the Emperor, and thus to expose the doer of them to the extremest penalty of the law; a falsehood told, a theft committed, a wrong word spoken, in the presence of any image or representation of the Emperor, might be construed as disrespect to his sacred majesty; even his bust on a coin constituted the locality an abode of the Imperial god and made it necessary for those who were there to behave as in the Divine presence. Domitian carried the theory of Imperial Divinity and the encouragement of "delation" to the most extravagant point; and thereby caused a strong reaction in the subsequent Imperial policy. Precisely in that time of extravagance occurs this extravagant exaggeration of the Imperial theory: that in one way or another every Asian must stamp himself overtly and visibly as loyal, or be forthwith disqualified from participation in ordinary social life and trading. How much of grim sarcasm, how much of literal truth, how much of exaggeration, there lies in those words,—*that no man should be able to buy or sell, save he that hath the mark of the Beast on his right hand or upon his forehead*,—it is impossible for us now to decide. It is probably safe to say that there lies in them a good deal of sarcasm, combined with so much resemblance to the real facts as should ensure the immediate comprehension of the readers. But that there is an ideal

truth in them, that they give a picture of the state of anxiety and apprehension, of fussy and over-zealous profession of loyalty which the policy of Domitian was producing in the Roman world, is certain.

Such is the description given by a contemporary of the Flavian persecution. It shows that persecution to have been an organized attempt to combine many influences for the extermination of the Christians, and not a mere sporadic though stern repression such as occurred repeatedly during the second century. But it is already certain that the Flavian persecution was of that character. Trajan, while admitting the same principle of State, that the Christians must be regarded as outlaws and treated like brigands, deprived persecution of its worst characteristics by forbidding the active search after Christians and requiring a formal accusation by a definite accuser. Under the Flavian Emperors we see an extremely cruel and bitter public movement against the Christians, an attempt to enlist religious awe on the side of the Empire, and a zealous participation of the Asian provincial bodies beginning from the Commune in the persecution as a proof of their loyalty.

A recent writer on this subject expresses doubt as to "the degree to which the worship of the Emperor had become the normal test applied to one accused of being a Christian."¹ How any doubt can remain in face of this passage, even were it alone, it is hard to see. It is difficult to devise a more effective and conclusive declaration that the religion of Christ and the religion of the Emperor were now explicitly and professedly ranged against one another, and that the alternative presented to every individual Christian was to "worship the image of the Beast" or death.

It furnishes no argument against this view of the character

¹ Mr. Anderson Scott in his excellent commentary in the Century Bible, p. 51.

of the Flavian persecution, that during the persecutions of the second century no attempt seems to have been made actively to rouse religious feeling among the populace as an ally against the new religion. The attempt was made in the last great persecution, during the times of Diocletian and his successors. Then again the Imperial government attempted to seek out and exterminate the Christians. It "took advantage of and probably stimulated a philosophical religious revival, characterized by strong anti-Christian feeling; and employed for its own ends the power of a fervid emotion acting on men who were often of high and strongly religious motives. Christianity had to deal with a reinvigorated and desperate religion, educated and spiritualized in the conflict with the Christians. The *Acta* of St. Theodotus of Amyra furnishes an instance of the way in which the devoted fanaticism of such men made them convenient tools for carrying out the purposes of the government; the approach of the new governor of Galatia and the announcement of his intentions struck terror into the hearts of the Christians; his name was Theotecnus, 'the child of God,' a by-name assumed by a philosophic pagan reactionary in competition with the confidence of the Christians in their Divine mission and the religious names which their converts assumed at baptism."¹ This description gives some idea of the state of things in the Province Asia which prompted the words of St. John. We need not doubt that Theotecnus and others like him also made use of signs and marvels for their purposes. Theotecnus seems to have been the author of the Acts of Pilate, an attack on the Christian belief. A remarkable inscription found near Acmonia in Phrygia is the epitaph of one of those pagan philosophic zealots, not an official of the Empire, but a leading citizen and priest in the Province.² He is described in his epitaph as having received the gift

¹ *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, ii. p. 506. ² *Ibid.*, ii. pp. 566-7.

of prophecy from the gods. His very name, Athanatos Epitynchanos, son of Pius, "Immortal Fortunate, son of Religious," is quite in the style of the *Pilgrim's Progress*, and marks his character and part in the drama of the time. His pretensions to prophetic gift were supported, we may be sure, by signs and marvels.

Less is known about the second last persecution, 249-51 A.D., in which Decius attempted in a similar way to seek out and exterminate the Christians. But another inscription of Acmonia is the epitaph of a relative, perhaps the grandfather or uncle of Athanatos Epitynchanos.¹ His name was Telesphoros, Consummator, and he was hierophant of a religious association in Acmonia; and his wife and his sons Epitynchanos and Epinikos (Victorious) made his grave in company with the whole association. This document is a proof that a similar religious pagan revival accompanied in Acmonia the persecution of Decius; and Acmonia must be accepted as a fair example of the provincial spirit generally. In fact it is evident that in those great persecutions a strong public feeling against the Christians acted on and stimulated the Emperors; and the Emperors in turn tried to stimulate and urge on the religious feeling of the public into fanaticism, as an aid in their attempt to exterminate the sectaries.

In both those later persecutions formal certificates of loyalty were issued by the government officials to those who had complied with the law and taken part in the ritual of the Imperial religion. These certificates form an apt parallel to the "mark of the Beast," and prove that that phrase refers to some real feature of the Flavian persecution in Asia.²

¹ The inscription was first published in the *Revue des Études Anciennes*, 1901, p. 276; and a correction of one letter Δ for A was made in the same journal, 1902, p. 82, by M. Chapot, and accepted by the present writer, 1902, p. 269.

² Several of these certificates have been found in Egypt, and are published in recent times.

These three persecutions stand apart from all the rest in a class by themselves. The intermediate Emperors shrank from thoroughly and logically putting in practice the principle which they all recognized in theory—that a Christian was necessarily disloyal and outlawed in virtue of the name and confession. All three are characterized by the same features and methods, which stand clearly revealed in the Apocalypse for the first of them and in many documents for the last.

The analogy of the official certificates in the time of Diocletian suggests that in the Flavian period the mark of the Beast on the right hand may have been a similar official certificate of loyalty. A provincial who was exposed to suspicion must carry in his hand such a certificate, while one who was notoriously and conspicuously loyal might be said to carry the mark on his forehead. In the figurative or symbolic language of the Apocalypse hardly anything is called by its ordinary and direct name, but things are indirectly alluded to under some other name, and every word has to be understood as implying something else than its ordinary connotation; and therefore it seems a fair inference that the mark on the forehead is the apocalyptic description of a universal reputation for conspicuous devotion to the cult of the Emperor.

The shadow of the Imperial religion lies deep over the whole book. But the remarkable feature of the book,—the feature which gave it its place in the New Testament in spite of some undeniable defects, which for a time made its place uncertain, and which still constitute a serious difficulty in reading it as an authoritative expression of the Christian spirit—is that the writer is never for a moment affected by the shadow. He was himself a sufferer, not to death, but to an extent which he would feel as a worse fate: he was debarred from helping and advising his Churches in the hour of trial. But there is no shadow of sorrow or discouragement.

ment or anxiety as to the issue. The Apocalypse is a vision of victory. The great Empire is already vanquished. It has done its worst; and it has already failed. Not all the Christians have been victors; but those who have deserted their ranks and dropped out of the fight have done so from inner incapacity, and not because the persecuting Emperor is stronger than they. Every battle fought to the end is a defeat for the Empire and a Christian victory. Every effort that the Emperor makes is only another opportunity for failing more completely. The victory is not to gain: it already is. The Church is the only reality in its city: the rest of the city is mere pretence and sham. The Church is the city, heir to all its history and its glories, heir too to its weaknesses and its difficulties and sometimes succumbing to them.

The most dangerous kind of error that can be made about the Apocalypse is to regard it as a literal statement and prediction of events. Thus, for example, xviii. 1-xix. 21 is not to be taken as a prophecy of the manner in which, or the time at which, the downfall of the great Empire and of the great City was to be accomplished; it is not to be understood as foreshadowing the Papacy, according to the foolish imaginings, "philosophy and vain deceit" as St. Paul would have called them (Col. ii. 8), of one modern school; it is not to be tortured by extremists on any side into conformity with their pet hatreds. Those are all idle fancies, which do harm to no one except them that waste their intellect on them. But it becomes a serious evil when the magnificent confidence and certainty of St. John as to the speedy accomplishment of all these things is distorted into a declaration of the immediate Coming of the Lord and the end of the world. Time was not an element in his anticipation. He was gazing on the eternal, in which time has no existence. Had any Asian reader asked him at what time these things should be accom-

plished, he would assuredly have answered in the spirit of Browning's Grammarian:—

What's time? Leave "now" to dogs and apes:
Man has forever.

Moreover, the Apocalypse declares in its plainest way that the series of the Emperors is to continue yet for a season. The Beast himself is the eighth Emperor; he is the climax and incarnation of the whole seven that precede; he is Domitian, the visible and present embodiment of the hated Imperial system. But the Beast has ten horns: *these are ten Emperors which have not been invested with Imperial power as yet; but they receive authority as Emperors with the Beast* (i.e., as units in the Imperial system) *for one hour. These shall war against the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them* (xvii. 12, 14).

The number *ten*, here as in ii. 10 (where Smyrna is to be exposed to persecution for ten days), merely denotes a finite number: the series of Emperors is limited and comes to an end. Rome shall perish. In one sense it is perishing now in every failure, in the victory of every martyr. *The Beast was and is not.* In another sense *the end is not yet.* But there is an end. The power of each Emperor is *for one hour*; he shall have his little span of pomp and pride, of power and failure; and he shall go down to the abyss like his predecessors.

W. M. RAMSAY.

*THE PERMANENT ELEMENTS OF RELIGION.*¹

II.

To the doctrine of future reinstatement objection has sometimes been taken on the ground that the importance attached to our present acts must necessarily be weakened if we do not believe them to be irrevocable; that the conviction that this life is man's sole chance throughout eternity, his sole share in existence, must make him value it more, and less inclined to waste or spoil it, whether in his own case or that of his fellows. Any chance whatever of a revision of what he has once done might make him regard his conduct less seriously, and make him less careful of it. Experience, however, seems to show that this is not so, that the contemplation of an after life makes men more earnest, causes them to value more their own personality which is permanent, and less the circumstances which are transitory. But whether this be so or not, the doctrine of reinstatement appears to be the only expedient for remedying the injustice which the progress of civilized society produces. That result of progress cannot be either deplored or admired, it is simply unavoidable. If the flock is to be kept pure, as Plato said, tainted sheep must be kept out: a society in which persons guilty of the offences which it taboos moved freely and without disgrace is unthinkable; crimes cannot be tabooed without those who have committed them being disgraced. But the resulting mischief, which is that persons who have once offended have no further reason for abstaining from giving offence, is remedied by the doctrines which on the one hand level all mankind by representing them all as too deeply tainted with sin to be able to reproach each other with impurity, and on the other represent the taboo as temporary, and

¹ Murtle Lecture, Aberdeen, December, 1903.

provide means for cleansing sooner or later any stain however deep. The expedient is, in fact, to treat the same persons as belonging to two separate societies—a civil society whose outlook is confined within certain horizons, and a religious society, with an outlook beyond the grave, and otherwise not conterminous with the civil community.

Although, then, those who habitually act rightly do so neither because they hope for anything to be gained thereby, nor fear the consequences of doing otherwise, the clarification of ideas has provided mankind in religion with an instrument that is potent in training those whose characters are in course of formation, and in reclaiming those whose conduct has been vitiated. The history of religion shows us indeed many cases in which wholly wrong values have been ascribed to acts, and in which the terrors of the supernatural world have been invoked to suppress acts that were either harmless or even beneficial. But yet the assertion sometimes made that religion is *per se* wholly unconnected with morals will scarcely stand the test of historical research, and gods and goddesses whose names we are accustomed to connect with evil things, when we learn more about them, are found concerned with the task of enjoining right and condemning wrong. Once mankind became convinced that their conduct was not indifferent to the power or powers by whom nature is controlled, the direction was given to the line of progress which identified the pleasure of those powers with the acts which tend to the preservation of the community. The identification of their pleasure with real morality has been attained, as much in human history has been attained, by a process which appears circuitous in the extreme; but here as elsewhere the triumph of progress has lain in the diversion of forces that were either useless or even harmful to the well-being and ennobling of the race.

And the third service of religion is as a means of

strengthening human weakness. The facts of the world as given by nature methodically studied, represent man as surrounded everywhere by abysses. What is behind him, and what is before him, are alike unknown, unexplored, stretching out into vast immensity. His own place appears fortuitous, his own destiny the result of accident. Methodical study constantly reduces the appearance of design in phenomena, accounting for that appearance by other causes, and of design and purpose in history as a whole the traces are yet more obscure. Probably to strong minds or to normal minds in times of quiet and prosperity this uncertainty and ignorance occasion little inconvenience, but weaker minds need some support, or need to have the abyss concealed from them by some sort of screen, and a little adversity is shown by experience to bring strong minds to the same level. It is not many months since some reverses in a war brought the most advanced of nations to talk of the need for a day of general humiliation in order to induce the heavenly powers to crown its arms with success. The inner history of men with the strongest will and the fewest scruples shows extraordinary relapses into even puerile superstitions. Now religion gives a final answer to most of these questions, and thus provides the stay which is necessary so often for human weakness. It introduces the human being to the power which lies behind phenomena, and, if it cannot always explain their purpose, it can assure him that they have a meaning, and that there is no reason to fear, since their conduct is in wise hands. The greater the confidence men have in the Being whom they supplicate for a special result, the greater it would appear is their resignation when the result falls out contrary to what they had desired and supplicated. Success brings fervent gratitude, but failure only in the rarest cases causes recrimination.

The belief that events are ordered by a wise will and

intelligence appears to be what underlies this power of religion to strengthen and console. By bringing man into some relation with the Ruler of the world, it gives him by prayer or sacrifice, or some other mode, the power to interfere somewhat himself with the direction of events. To the council where the future is deliberated and arranged it introduces, if not his vote, at any rate his petition; into the causes which operate on the great world machine, it gives a place to his individual will and interest, his loves and hates. Whither the arm of the mightiest cannot reach, where the united forces of mankind are ineffectual, thither the voice of prayer penetrating can, it teaches, move the hand that moves the world. And if experience shows that the effectiveness of this force cannot be relied on, still the knowledge that events are arranged and directed, and not left to blind forces, gives the system which furnishes it the value for life with which we are now dealing. Just as man reads into the operations of nature motive and design, so he interprets the course of events as realizing some intention with which he can sympathize, and fragments of which he can understand. And as to the gratification of his own schemes he is willing to sacrifice his comfort and even himself, so he is prepared to be sacrificed in the realization of a scheme with which he identifies his own. His own sufferings and losses are not in vain if they contribute to the furthering of the object which should be furthered. The focus of his own religion provides a point round which the data of history can be grouped, to which they led up, and whither they again converge; as the Jews put it, all the prophets prophesied of the Messiah, giving as it were clues concerning the direction whereto events were trending, showing which side would be ultimately victorious in the world-struggle, and with which side man should cast in his lot, introducing into his conduct the spirit of loyalty, which accounts for

difficulties by the nature of the whole plan, by his own ignorance, by anything rather than any defect in the arrangements of the sovereign organizer.

Nor should we overlook its value as compensating for the inequalities of life, and so inducing contentment and tranquility, where otherwise there might be discontent or repining. The need for a world that sets this right is at least to some extent felt in proportion to the degree in which the arrangements of the present dispensation fall heavily on individuals. Hence a doctrine that the mere fact of a man being miserable in this world will be a title to happiness in another is one from which few important religious systems are free, and which has to some degree the authority of the Gospel itself. Of it that asceticism which courts torture in this life in order to increase the compensation to be received in another is the abnormal development. But in cases where the torment is not voluntarily undergone, but is the product of misfortune or disease, those who are familiar with the hospital and the workhouse will probably attest the soothing and comforting effects of religious beliefs. Represented as a surgical operation, which by temporary or momentary discomfort procures permanent ease and happiness, the misfortune assumes an utterly different character from that which must attach to it when it is regarded as having no purpose, no meaning, no kindly intent. Diverted from the agony which he is enduring to the contemplation of the happiness to which access is thereby provided, the patient is less inclined to envy those who have indeed no such trial, but can look forward to no such result. The nakedness of nature, with its unfair arrangements which hit many so hard, is thus fully concealed; and death itself tolerated or even welcomed, not as a mode of obtaining cessation from trouble, but of entry to a kingdom that has been earned.

In all three functions, of which the first appears to touch

the surface of human life, whereas the others sink deeper, it is clear that there is much common ground, nor is it easy to say where one function terminates and another commences. And with regard to all it may be observed that man adds to the data of nature something similar to that which the artist adds when out of a block of stone he produces a statue. Consecrated days, consecrated places, consecrated persons, exist for the mind that is capable of appreciating the notion of sanctity: for nature and for other animals than man they exist not. Where nature presents a mixture of what is agreeable to man and what is disagreeable, collateral surfeit and starvation, happiness and misery, religion sees only a family provided for by a loving father, or a good force resisting and steadily overcoming one that is evil. Out of the block of marble it rejects all that conceals or interferes with the statue which it does not create but find. The objection to the process, because the objective reality of the result cannot be proved, seems akin to that which some fanatics have cherished against the plastic art itself; the makers of statues, Mohammed taught, would be punished more severely than any other criminals: for they would be told to give life to their creation, and would be unable to do so. As grave an objection to their art as that which is raised against religious systems, when they are judged not by their practical results, but by their metaphysical groundwork. To make a living figure was not in the sculptor's intention, nor would such a feat have gratified the desire which it was his purpose to supply; and likewise it is not the end of the religious system to provide an account of phenomena which is objectively true, but one which will render life decent, and help man to be moral and to be resigned and courageous.

That is the service to which the instinct of worship can be made subservient, just as the organs of speech can

be made to express ideas ; though no one believes now in any object having a natural name, and though there are no natural names, yet one language can surpass another in euphony, in clearness and expressiveness.

In all three functions the question of the objective reality of the teachings of religion in no way affects its value to the community. If men walk safely and courageously because the abyss is screened off, it matters not at all whether the screen be solid, or thin, unstable, and easily pulled away. The consolation which replaces to the miserable all that the fortunate enjoy is a valuable asset to mankind ; its value is not extinguished by the demonstration that it is illusory. The motives that will inspire men to work for the common good and sacrifice their own pleasure and profit to that of their fellows have all the characteristics of a force ; often indeed they have been wrongly utilized ; but it does not follow that they should be wasted.

The permanent elements of religion lie, then, in the permanent needs of mankind, and the existence of religion is bound up with their continuance. And though all three may be said to be of unlimited duration, probably with the progress of mankind the function of religion as moralizing and strengthening loses in importance, whereas its function as adorning life gains. With the advancing knowledge of nature whole regions wherein man once found his way by prayer and sacrifice are flooded with the light of science. Bounded indeed by abysses, the road whereon he walks becomes continually broader and smoother ; the fantastic figures which in the darkness or haze of ignorance filled the air are found out in the light of knowledge to be smoke and vapour. But the time is still at an immeasurable distance when the elements of uncertainty in man's life will have been reduced to a minimum, and when it will cease to be dominated by fear and hope. Still less can we

look forward to a time when the differences in strength and stability that are to be found existing between different ages, different sexes, and different races will have been merged in uniformity.

So too the need for religion as a moralizing and reforming force appears to be of unlimited, but not necessarily infinite duration. That vicious inclinations may be stamped out as diseases are stamped out seems not impossible; and according as the effort of inculcating morality becomes less, and the need for reformation diminishes, there will be the less need for calling in the aid of belief in unseen forces to make men virtuous. There are those who think the time for this has already come, and that morality can be best taught without promises and threats, and without authorization; but the fact that recurrence has constantly to be made to those aids in cases where men have tried to dispense with them appears to show that such a view is in the present state of human progress visionary or premature.

But while in process of time the human mind may grow vastly stronger and the human will vastly better, the need for what we have called the ornamentation of life will rather strengthen than weaken. It is the tendency of science to exhibit more and more of the nakedness of nature: in the study of history to find less and less of a directing providence, organizing events after the style of a popular romance, in which the good are rewarded and the villains punished; hence the side of life which is ideal becomes more and more necessary as progress encourages materialism.

The correct analysis of the functions which religion performs in society has a tendency, in the first place, to make religions more mutually tolerant; in the second, to cause their assimilation within certain limits. A standard being given, as the result of a study of what mankind require or

need, the comparison of various creeds is based on the extent to which they fulfil such requirements. And at times comparison is easy, and a mere statement of the facts gives us the right to applaud or condemn. Certain ceremonies can be condemned as unaesthetic or barbarous; certain mythologies as demoralizing; the encouragement of certain tendencies as pernicious either to the persons in whom they are fostered or to others. There is no intolerance involved in condemning practices or doctrines on any of these grounds. But where their continuance is not manifestly inconsistent with the interests of the race as a whole, it will probably be acknowledged that there are subjective varieties which will both account for and justify the continuance of many different creeds. Even if a creed fail to come up to the best known standard of what is refined and moralizing, it will be acknowledged that for some minds the best is unsuitable; just as the brilliancy and clearness of light may be known by tests, yet it is not certain that the most brilliant light is suited to every eye.

For the assimilation of different cults we have evidence in what has been going on in the last centuries and may be expected to continue in the future. To some indeed the purification of other cults besides the Christian seems visionary and unpractical; but is it not equally so to hope for the conversion on a large scale to Christianity of millions of men who have a well reasoned theology of their own, and on whom many generations of missionaries have worked with no effect; most of all at a time when the belief in the historical basis of Christianity is continually becoming, at least in the opinion of the most authorized, more and more insecure? In place of such a hope we regard it as more probable that the improvement of the standards of Christian countries may cause those of non-Christian countries to improve. The higher morality

being ascribed in Christian countries to their religion and identified with it, similar standards by force of imitation will spread to those countries of which Christianity is not the official religion; and will by patriots be made out to be in harmony with their official or native systems, however little connexion there may historically be between the two.

Judaism, Parseeism, even Mohammedanism as interpreted by those who have chosen to follow European lights, differ but slightly, if at all, in the conduct which they inculcate; the difference between the teachers lies not in their conclusions, but in the process by which they are attained; dimly or clearly they perceive that the veneration which their races have inherited for certain names and certain books may be utilized for the benefit of the community, and that that possibility of utilization is the only chance which the system has of holding its own; efficiency here as in every other department of life deciding whether the instrument shall continue in use or not. And the historical fact that the efficiency of the premier religion has varied vastly in different ages, from almost entire uselessness in some to extreme potency in others, gives them some ground for hoping that the failure of their own systems in the past may be consistent with success in the future.

In such cases it would seem to be the wiser course for the missionary to encourage rather than to ridicule the new gloss that is put on the old text; to hold that if those representatives of non-Christian cults who wish to emulate Christian virtues can do so by forcing them into the framework of their own religion, they should be encouraged in the attempt; the difficulty of reforming the race being so great that each movement that aims thereat without introducing fresh evils deserves our sympathy.

But it is also a fact that the doctrine as well as the

practice of the less fashionable religions has a tendency to assimilate itself to that of the most advanced civilizations. Analogues are sought and easily found in the native cult to the concepts in which the world-religion expresses itself; while native names are retained, the difference in doctrine lessens, since the needs which dogmas gratify do not differ widely in different human breasts. And further, there is a tendency even to assimilate ceremonies, and to find out reasons for adopting the same seasons for festivity and mourning. Thus some of the wiser of the Jews of our day are adopting the Christian Sunday as their day of rest instead of their Sabbath; rightly holding that the change can involve no principle of their religion, and that it is better that their day of rest should unite them with their fellow-citizens than separate them.

But if this is the case with systems which have often been hostile and antagonistic, it is yet more likely to result with those whose differences are smaller. When the problem of theology comes to be to find out what doctrines are most conducive to human progress and human happiness, the possibility of approximately solving it, and so of obtaining ultimately some sort of harmony, is considerably increased. It is no longer a question of interpreting and comparing texts, or of ascertaining by archæological inquiry the nature of ancient ceremonies, but of investigating the working of various beliefs on the human mind, and the effect, if any, which they exercise on the character, a process in which deductive and inductive methods must necessarily supplement and correct each other. The claim made by revelation is not so much that of conveying to mankind information which could not otherwise be obtained; it is rather to be the acknowledged authority for religion, the recognition of which is requisite if the services which have been analyzed are to be performed. The purpose of the scientific inquirer is to lift the veil, that

of the apologist to replace it ; let it be once recognized that there is a time for replacing as well as a time for lifting, the two will be found to be co-operating, to be in a way antagonistic.

The need for sacred books of recognized authority can easily be shown whether from history or from *à priori* considerations. Paganism collapsed because, having no recognized authority for its beliefs and practices, it was confronted by a system which was founded on the recognized word of God. Islam carried Arabia by storm because it could oppose the word of God to beliefs for which there was no authority ; and before it those branches of Christianity which had no vernacular Bible perished, whereas those which had one survived. Accessions in our time are made both to Christianity and to Islam from tribes that have no sacred literature, but those which have sacred books rarely abandon their religion. For the ornamentation of life, as the ancient religions show, much can be done with the aid of myths, stories which are not ordinarily believed, but to which association has lent a charm ; but those which are to help in reforming the fallen and strengthening the weak must be believed. The assertions made by him who aims at these effects cannot rest on his own private authority, for the door is thus opened to charlatanism ; their authority must be one that is popularly regarded as sufficient, such as is attached by proverbs to the Bible or the Gospel, each of which is in popular parlance synonymous with infallible truth. It is that which in theory the preacher merely inculcates or enforces ; and the power behind him is a sort of atmosphere created by a series of generations with whom the belief in the soundness of that authority has been normal, and disbelief in it paradoxical.

It has not, however, been ordinarily necessary to press the authority of a sacred book too closely, the amount of emphasis laid thereon being made to vary in accordance

with the principle that they who are whole need not a physician, but those that are sick. In many communities it is found that what is ostensibly the sacred book has been ousted by matter that is far inferior both morally and intellectually to the original volume : whereas in others it has given way to beliefs and practices which present a real advance on the earlier condition. Probably in all the cases in which complaint is made by reformers of the burying of the word of God under a mass of secondary matter the introduction of that secondary matter is not merely due to perversity, but in part at least to the supervention of needs which the earlier sacred books were not calculated to supply. But what can be learned from all these cases—and the religions which have had the greatest popularity supply illustrations—is that the authority of the sacred book can at once be ostensibly recognized and virtually superseded. Reverence can be maintained for it simultaneously with a tendency towards extreme divergence from what it literally teaches, whether this divergence be in a progressive or in a retrogressive direction ; a proceeding which at times is covered by the arts of the apologist, whose purpose is to reconcile the oracles with the data of experience, constituting the mass of knowledge that accumulates between the production of the oracles and the apologist's time. His function may be represented as that of bridging over the gulf between the world of every-day life, regulated by rules that work invariably, the world of causes with precisely calculable effects, the world whose history and mechanics are ascertained by observation and experiment ; and the world in which the dealings are between God and the soul, in which morality from being an expedient for compassing individual and general well-being is raised to the rank of an eternal law, and in which man from his humble position as an accident of matter is exalted to that of an immortal.

The task of the apologist is therefore one which is in agreement with the interests of the community, whether it be in his power to produce arguments that science can recognize, or whether it be only possible for him to make out a plausible case for a system of which the benefits can be very considerable. Just as we have seen that life can be equally ornamented whether that ornament be impenetrable, or be merely sufficient to cover, but capable of being rent away, so what is wanted from the apologist is rather that he should render the employment for certain purposes and on certain occasions of antiquated opinions tolerable and permissible than that he should put back the hands of progress in all spheres and for all times and occasions.

The arts of the apologist, employed it might be thought in the interest of a particular dogma, are employed in the interest of human society; certain means having been discovered by experience to be the sole cure for a variety of ills, it is his purpose to strengthen the hands of those who use them. Working on the sound principles that those who are whole need not a physician, and that the sinners, not the righteous, need calling to repentance, his aim is not to maintain anything superannuated in the face of progress, but to render suitable for modern wants the weapons for which neither has a substitute been found, nor is there any prospect of finding one: performing for science itself this great service that he helps to maintain the world in a condition which is favourable for scientific progress; for society that he helps to supply a perpetual corrective to the deficiencies which its progress brings more and more to light.

For the reconstruction of the beliefs which the nineteenth century destroyed we need not then look for wonderful confirmation of Scripture, though it is quite conceivable that many a fashionable opinion may be yet overthrown; but to a more general recognition among the educated of the

services which religious beliefs and institutions perform, of the loss to the community which their abolition would involve. Into the arguments by which these are analysed it is unnecessary to introduce any premise which does not rest on observations and experiences which any age and any country can provide. Where, therefore, the sacred books which form the groundwork of religion are unable to maintain their own claim to sanctity, where, if that be demonstrated, their content is in disagreement with the results which experience has made certain, it is not impossible to confer on them a factitious and conventional sanctity, which is all that is required for the function which is demanded of them. Such sanctity as is conferred on sacred places, sacred buildings, sacred persons, is similarly factitious and conventional: nature understands it not; only men who have been initiated understand it; and when the needs of the community require, it can be withdrawn. To those, however, who have been initiated, consecrated ground and consecrated buildings mean something, awake certain emotions, arouse certain feelings, which seem totally different from what is ordinarily associated with the terms factitious and conventional. Those feelings appear to be no whit less strong than they were when men believed that sacred places were protected by heavenly flames which consumed those who violated them, or that disrespect to sacred persons and offices would be punished by natural convulsions. The community reserves to itself the right to assign the limits within which that sanctity may be recognized; but within those limits it not only permits but encourages, or at times can even command, the gratification of the emotion with which that term is associated. The properties which are to be found in wood and stone, bricks and mortar, do not leave them when they form part of a consecrated building: yet those who are fully aware of this may also hold that the community is better off for

having consecrated buildings, invested with a dignity and with privileges which unconsecrated buildings do not share.

That degree of sanctity the community will see fit to leave intact to the sacred books whence are derived the doctrines and the histories which are inseparable from the ceremonies of religion, and which render them commemorative or sacramental. A time there was for iconoclasm when every malefactor could find refuge in a sacred place, when for half the year no work might be done for fear of violating saints' days, when whole realms of nature were left unexplored for fear of disproving some assertion in a sacred book ; such superstitions had to be pulled up by the roots to enable men to learn that not only the Sabbath, but all dogmas and ceremonies are made for man and not man for them. Yet the community whose Founder taught the subordination of the Sabbath to human needs is also the community whence the consecration of one day out of seven has spread furthest and widest ; retaining that consecration for many a reason which experience and the study of human nature suggest ; and covering those reasons over with the ornament of a historical or mythical commemoration either of the completion of the universe or of its regeneration. And that religion will be completest and best suited to mankind in which each institution and each dogma admits of a similar analysis : made indeed for man, and contributing in some way that admits of explanation to the ennobling of the race, yet decorated and adorned with sacred histories, connected with the conception of man as above nature and immortal. The Sabbath and all other religion were made for man and not man for the institutions.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

CHARACTERISTICS OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK.

VIII.

THIS not being a formal treatise, demanding completeness, we may now leave the Article and pass on to the Pronouns in general. A very short excursion among the Personal Pronouns brings us up against another untrustworthy evidence of "the dependence of the language on Semitic speech," in the "extraordinary frequency of the oblique cases of the personal pronouns used without emphasis" (Blass, p. 164). The phenomenon is only another feature of popular Greek, and can be matched from papyri in which no Semite had a hand. Cf. *Ox. Pap.* 299 (1st cent.), Δάμπωνι μυοθηρευτῆ ἔδωκα αὐτῶ . . . δραχμὰς η. Cf. also Kälker, *Quaestiones de elocutione Polybiana*, p. 274, where διὸ καὶ πάλιν ἐπερρώσθησαν διὰ ταῦτα and similar redundancies are cited from Polybius. I return to this matter shortly, remarking only that dependence on Semitic would need to be very strongly evidenced from other phenomena before we could accept such an account of a feature affecting the whole fabric of every-day speech.

The *Reflexive* pronouns have developed some unclassical uses, notably that in the plural they are all fused into the forms originally appropriated to the third person. The presence or absence of this confusion in the singular is a nice test of the degree of culture in a writer of Common Greek. In the papyri there are a few examples of it in very illiterate documents,¹ while in the plural the use is general, beginning to appear even in classical times.² This answers to what we find in the New Testament, where some seventy cases of the plural occur without a single genuine example of the singular;³ late scribes, reflecting

¹ See *Cl. Rev.* xv. 441, xviii. 154. I find it rather hard to believe that Lucian's text is sound where he is recorded as using this eminently illiterate idiom.

² Polybius always uses αὐτῶν (Kälker, *Quaestiones*, p. 277).

³ In 1 Cor. x. 29 ἐαυτοῦ="one's."

the developments of their own time, have introduced it into John xviii. 34 and Romans xiii. 9 (Gal. v. 14). As in the papyri, *ἑαυτούς* sometimes stands for *ἀλλήλους*, and sometimes is itself replaced by the personal pronoun. In one class of phrases we find *ἑαυτοῦ* used rather lightly, on sepulchral inscriptions especially. A son will describe his father as *ὁ πατήρ*, *ὁ ἴδιος πατήρ*, or *ὁ ἑαυτοῦ πατήρ*, and the difference between the three is not very easily discernible. In a number of these inscriptions contained in the third volume of the *Inscr. Maris Aegaei* I count twenty-one examples with *ἴδιος*, ten with *ἑαυτοῦ*, and sixteen with neither. The papyrus formula, used in all legal documents where a woman is the principal, *μετὰ κυρίου τοῦ ἑαυτῆς ἀνδρός* (*ἀδελφοῦ*, etc.), gives a parallel for this rather faded use of the reflexive. It starts the more serious question whether *ἴδιος* is to be supposed similarly weakened in Hellenistic. This is often affirmed, and is vouched for by no less an authority than Deissmann (*B.S.* 123 f.). He calls special attention to passages in the LXX. like Job xxiv. 12 (*οἴκων ἰδίων*), Proverbs xxvii. 15 (*τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου*), ix. 12 (*τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ ἀμπελῶνος . . . τοῦ ἰδίου γεωργίου*), xxii. 7 (*ἰδίους δεσπόταις*), in which the pronoun has nothing whatever answering to it in the original. He reminds us that the "exhausted *ἴδιος*" occurs in writers of the literary *Κοινή*, and that in Josephus even *οἰκεῖος* comes to share this weakening: a few Attic inscriptions from the 1st cent. B.C. (Meisterhans,³ p. 235) show *ἴδιος* with the like attenuated content. Our inference must be that in Acts xxiv. 24 St. Luke is not ironically suggesting the poverty of Felix's title, and in Matthew xxii. 5 there is no stress on the disloyal guest's busying himself with his own farm instead of someone else's. I venture, however, to think that this doctrine of exhausted *ἴδιος* is in some danger of being worked too hard. In *Cl. Rev.* xv. 440 f. I have put down all the occurrences of *ἴδιος* in the first two volumes of the Berlin Papyri, which

contain nearly 700 documents of very various antiquity. It is certainly remarkable that in all these passages there is not one which goes to swell Deissmann's list. Not even in the Byzantine papyri have we a single case where ἴδιος has to be left out, where the English *own* does not exactly represent it. In a papyrus as early as the Ptolemaic period we find the possessive pronoun added—ὄντα ἡμῶν ἴδιον, which is exactly like "our own." (Cf. 2 Pet. iii. 16; Tit. i. 12; Acts ii. 8.) This use became normal in the Byzantine age, in which ἴδιος still had force enough to make such phrases as ἰδίαν καὶ νομίμην γυναῖκα. Now in the face of the literary examples I cannot venture to deny *in toto* the weakening of ἴδιος, still less the practical equivalence of ἴδιος and ἑαυτοῦ, which is evident from the sepulchral inscriptions just cited, as well as from such passages as Proverbs ix. 12 and 1 Corinthians vii. 2. But the strong signs of life in the word throughout the papyri have to be allowed for. In correlating these rather perplexing phenomena we may bring in the following considerations. (1) The fact that Josephus similarly weakens οἰκέϊος seems to show that the question turns on thought rather than on words. (2) It is possible, as our own language shows, for a word to be simultaneously in possession of a full and an attenuated meaning. People who say "It's an awful nuisance" will without any sense of incongruity say "How awful!" when they read of some great catastrophe in the newspaper. Of course the habitual light use of such words does tend in time to attenuate their content, but even this rule is not universal. "To annoy" is in Hellenistic σκύλλειν,¹ and in modern French *gêner*. There was a time when the Greek in thus speaking compared his trouble to the pains of flaying alive, and the Frenchman recalled the thought of *Gehenna*, but the original full sense was wholly unknown to the speaker of a later day. Sometimes,

¹ See EXPOSITOR, VI. iii. 273 f.

however, the full sense lives on, and even succeeds in ousting the lighter sense, as in our word *vast*, the adverb of which is no longer available as a mere synonym of *very*.

(3) The use of the English *own* will help us somewhat. "Let each man be fully assured in his own mind" (Rom. xiv. 5) has the double advantage of being the English of our daily speech and of representing literally the original ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ νοῷ. What function has the adjective there? It is not, as normally, an emphatic assertion of property: I am in no danger of being assured in someone else's mind. It is simply a method of laying stress on the personal pronoun, a fact which shows at once how the equivalence of ἴδιος and ἐαυτοῦ in certain locutions comes in. Now when we look at the examples of "exhausted ἴδιος" we find that they very largely are attached to words of relationship or the like. Husband and wife account for seven examples in the New Testament, and other relationships, including that of master and slave, for a good many more. A large number come under the category of the mind, thoughts and passions, and parts of the body. House, estate, riding-animal, country or language, and similar very intimate possessions receive the epithet. If occasionally this sense of property is expressed where we should not express it, this need not compromise the assertion that the word itself was always as strong as our English word *own*. There are very many places in the New Testament, as in the papyri, where its emphasis is undeniable: e.g. Matthew ix. 1, Luke vi. 41, John i. 42 (note its position), v. 18, etc., Acts i. 25, 1 Corinthians iii. 8, Galatians vi. 5, Hebrews vii. 27, and many others quite as decisive. I feel therefore quite justified in repeating the argument that in John i. 42 τὸν ἀδελφὸν τὸν ἴδιον is meant to hint that the unnamed companion of Andrew, presumably John, fetched *his* brother. What to do in such cases as Acts xxiv. 24 and Matthew xxii. 5 is not easy to say. The Revisers insert *own* in the

latter place, and it is fair to argue that the word suggests the strength of the counter-attraction, which is more fully expressed in the companion parable, Luke xiv. 18. Drusilla is less easily dealt with. It is hardly enough to plead that the epithet is customarily attached to the relationship, for (with the Revisers) we instinctively feel that *own* is appropriate in 1 Peter iii. 1, and similar passages, but inappropriate here. It is the only New Testament passage where I feel any real difficulty; and since B stands almost alone in reading *ιδία* the temptation to side for once with \aleph is very strong¹—if indeed the “Western” text is not to be followed.

Before leaving *ιδιος* something should be said about the use of *ὁ ἴδιος* without a noun expressed. We have this in John i. 11, xiii. 1, Acts iv. 23, xxiv. 23. In the papyri we find the singular used thus as a term of endearment to near relations, thus: *ὁ δεῖνα τᾶ ἰδίῳ χαίρειν*. In the EXPOSITOR for 1901 (VI. iii. 277) I ventured to cite this as a possible encouragement to those (including Weiss) who would translate Acts xx. 28 “the blood of One who was His own.” Matthew xxvii. 24, according to the text of $\aleph L$ and the later authorities, will supply a parallel for the grammatical ambiguity: there as here we have to decide whether the second genitive is an adjective qualifying the first or a noun dependent on it.

We pass on to the Relatives. The limiting of *ὅστις* is a very apparent feature in the vernacular, where the nominative (and the neuter accusative) covers very nearly all the occurrences of the pronoun. The phrase *ἕως ὅτου* is the only exception in New Testament Greek. The obsolescence of the distinction between *ὅς* and *ὅστις* is asserted by Blass for Luke, but not for Paul. A type like Luke ii. 4, *εἰς πόλιν Δαυεὶδ ἣτις καλεῖται Βηθλεέμ*, may be exactly paralleled from Herodotus (see Blass, p. 173) and from papyri: so in

¹ I suggest that the error arose simply from the commonness of the combination *ἡ ἰδία γυνή*, which was here transferred to a context in which it was not at home.

an invitation form $\alpha\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\nu \eta\tau\iota\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu \bar{\iota}\epsilon$, "to-morrow, which is the 15th." Cf. Matthew xxvii. 62. Hort, in his note on 1 Peter ii. 11 (p. 133), allows that "there are some places in the New Testament in which $\acute{\omicron}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ cannot be distinguished from $\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$." "In most places, however, of the New Testament," he proceeds, " $\acute{\omicron}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ apparently retains its strict classical force, either generic, 'which, as other like things,' or essential, 'which by its very nature.'" A large number of the exceptions, especially in Lucan writings, seem to me, whether agreeing or disagreeing with classical use, by no means cases of *equivalence* between $\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ and $\acute{\omicron}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$. Some of them would have been expressed with $\acute{\omicron}\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho$ in Attic: thus in Acts xi. 28 we seem to expect $\eta\pi\epsilon\rho \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron$. Others show a subtle stress on the relative, which can be brought out by various paraphrases, as Luke i. 20, "which for all that." Or $\acute{\omicron}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ represents what in English would be expressed with a demonstrative and a conjunction, as Luke x. 42, "and it shall not be taken away." In Matthew we find $\acute{\omicron}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ used four times at the beginning of a parable, where though the principal figure is formally described as an individual he is really a *type*, and $\acute{\omicron}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ is therefore appropriate. I may refer to Blass, p. 173, for examples of $\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ used for $\acute{\omicron}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$, with indefinite reference. The large number of places in which $\acute{\omicron}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ is obviously right according to classical use may fairly stand as proof that the distinction is not yet dead. I must not stay to trace the distinction further here, but may venture on the assertion that the two relatives are never absolutely convertible, however blurred may be the outlines of the classical use in Luke, and possibly in sporadic passages outside his writings. I should mention that Kälker asserts for Polybius (*Quaest. de eloc. Polyb.* 245 f.) that $\acute{\omicron}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ is used for $\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ before words beginning with a vowel for no more serious reason than the avoidance of hiatus; and I must add that among twenty-three more or less unclassical examples in the Lucan books fourteen do happen to achieve this result. I chronicle this

fact as in duty bound, but without suggesting any inclination to regard it as a key to our problem. If Kälker is right for Polybius—and there certainly seems weight in his remark that this substitution occurs just where the forms of ὅς end in a vowel—we may have to admit that the distinction was throughout the *Koinḗ* period rather fine. It would be like the distinction between our relatives *who* and *that*, which in a considerable proportion of sentences are sufficiently convertible to be selected mostly according to our sense of rhythm or euphony: this, however, does not in the least imply that the distinction between them is even blurred, much less lost.

The *attraction* of the relative—which, of course, does not involve ὅστις—is a construction at least as popular in late as in classical Greek. It appears abundantly in the papyri, even in the most illiterate of them; and in legal documents we have the principle stretched further in formulae such as ἀρουρῶν δέκα δύο ἢ ὅσων ἐὰν ὦσιν οὐσῶν. There are exceptions to the general rule of attraction, on which see Blass, p. 173.

Confusion of relative and indirect interrogative is not uncommon. “Ὅσος, οἶος, ὅποῖος, ἡλίκος occur in the New Testament as indirect interrogatives, and also—with the exception of ἡλίκος—as relatives,” Dr. Moulton observes (WM. 210, note); and in the papyri even ὅς can be used in an indirect question. A good example is found in the Revenue Law of Ptolemy Philadelphus (3rd cent. B.C.), φράζοντες [τό τε] αὐτῶν ὄνομα καὶ ἐν ἧι κώμῃ οἰκοῦσιν καὶ π[όσου τιμῶν]ται. So already in Sophocles, *Ant.* 542, *Oed. T.* 1068, with Jebb’s notes; and in prose Plato, *Euthyphro*, xviii., ἃ μὲν γὰρ διδάσιν, παντὶ δῆλον. It is superfluous to say that this cannot possibly be reversed, so as to justify the A.V. in Matthew xxvi. 50. The more illiterate papyri and inscriptions show τίς for relative ὅστις not infrequently, as εὔρον γεοργὸν τίς αὐτὰ ἐλκύσῃ—τίνος ἐὰν χρίαν ἔχῃς—τίς ἂν κακῶς ποιήσῃ, etc. Jebb on Soph.

Oed. T. 1141 remarks that while “*τίς* in classical Greek can replace *ὅστις* only where there is an indirect question . . . Hellenistic Greek did not always observe this rule: Mark xiv. 36.” I do not think there is adequate reason for punctuating James iii. 13 or Acts xiii. 25 so as to bring in this misuse of *τίς*, but Luke xvii. 8 is essentially like it.¹ The New Testament use of *ὅτι* for *τί* in a direct question is a curious example of the confusion between the two categories, a confusion much further developed in our own language.

Modern Greek developments are instructive when we are examining the relatives and interrogatives. The normal relative is *ποῦ*, followed by the proper case of the demonstrative, as *ὁ γίαιτρός ποῦ τὸν ἔστειλα*, “the doctor whom I sent for.” The difference between *ποῦ* and *ἤν* in their original functions is small enough to give the Hebraists sufficiently plausible grounds for assigning the modern idiom to Semitic influence, as Jannaris (*Hist. Gram.* § 1439) does in the case of *ἦς τὸ θυγάτριον αὐτῆς* and the like. (Blass thinks this last is “specially suggested by Semitic usage,” though he cites an example from Hypereides: as we have seen, it appears in the papyri.) The interrogative now is mostly *ποιός*, for *τίς* has practically come down to the indeclinable *τί*, just as our *what* (historically identical with the Latin *quod*) has become indifferent in gender. The New Testament decidedly shows the early stages of this use of *ποιός*. It will not do for us to refine very much on the distinction between the two pronouns. The weakening of the special sense of *ποιός* called into being a new pronoun to express the sense *qualis*, viz. *ποταπός*, which was the old *ποδαπός*, “of what country?” modified by popular etymology to suggest *πότε*, and thus denuded of its meaning-association with *ἡμεδαπός* and *ύμεδαπός*.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

¹ I must retract the denial I gave in *Cl. Rev.* xv. 441.

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF THE SECOND
EPISTLE OF PETER.

i. 1. Συμeww & AKLP “*al. longe plu.*” Ti Treg WH^m Spitta Weiss Kühl von Soden Zahn, Σιμων B vg sah boh WH. It is far more easy to suppose that Σίμων was a correction of Συμeww than the reverse, as Συμeww is only used of Peter in one other passage of the New Testament, viz., Acts xv. 14, where the MSS. all agree, but the Vulg. and several other versions read Σίμων. I cannot think the record of B so good in this epistle as to justify us in following it against the weight of the other MSS. as well as against internal probability.

i. 3. ιδία δοξη & ACP 13 vg sah boh Syrr. Ti Treg WH^m v. Soden Weiss Spitta Kühl Keil +, δια δοξης BKL 31 “*al. longe plu.*” WH. The recurrence of δια in the sentence πάντα ημwv τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν . . . δεδωρημένης διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ καλέσαντος ημᾶς διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς· δι’ ὧν τὰ μέγιστα . . . ἐπαγγέλματα δεδώρηται, ἵνα διὰ τούτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως, makes it more likely that δια should have been written by mistake for ιδία than the reverse; δόξη would then be corrected to δόξης. Again δια δόξης is too vague to convey a meaning; while ἴδιος is a favourite word with 2 Peter and ιδία δόξη gives an excellent sense, “He called us, drew us by His own divine perfection,” cf. “we love Him, because He first loved us.”

i. 4. δι’ ὧν τα τιμια καὶ μεγιστα ημιν B spec (*bis*) WH Weiss, δι’ ὧν τα τιμια ημιν καὶ μεγιστα & KL + Ti, δι’ ὧν τα μεγιστα καὶ τιμια ημιν ACP 13. 31, 68 Syr. Bodl. + Treg (*sed* A 68 Syr. Bodl. *υμιν pro ημιν*). As regards the order of the epithets, B&KL agree in placing the positive first, thus avoiding the very unnatural anti-climax. It is true that examples of the anti-climax may be found in other

writers, but only when the epithets are not *in pari materia*, as in Xen. *Cyrop.* II. 4. 29 δυνατωτάτων καὶ προθύμων, where the two characteristics do not necessarily vary together. The position of the dative in B seems to be the true one; that in X is explained by the desire to bring it under the influence of τίμια. The order in A seems to have originated in the accidental or intentional omission of τίμια καὶ and its wrong insertion from the margin. A appears to be right in reading ὑμῖν, as we can hardly understand the following γένησθε without it. Confusion between ἡμεῖς and ὑμεῖς is very common, and the change here is explained by the preceding ἡμᾶς in ver. 3. Spitta, reading τίμια ἡμῖν, inserts ὑμῖν after ἐπαγγέλματα.

i. 12. μελλήσω X ABCP vg Ti Treg WH, ουκ αμελήσω KL, ου μελλήσω tol Cass, μελήσω Field (*Otium Norv.* ii. p. 151). The insertion of the negative is an attempt to get over the awkwardness of μελλήσω, "I shall be about to." Field quotes Suidas μελήσω· σπούδασω, φροντίσω. Hesychius and Photius wrongly ascribe this force to μελλήσω, perhaps from a recollection of the received reading of this passage. Schleusner's note on Photius is (*Cur. Nov.* p. 227) "pro μελλήσω necessario reponendum est μελήσω." Other instances of the personal construction, μέλω for μέλει μοι, are found in Eur. *Herc. F.* 772, θεοὶ τῶν ἀδίκιον μέλουσι καὶ τῶν ὀσίων ἐπατεῖν, Plut. *Vit.* 395.

εν τη παρουση αληθεια. For the difficult παρούση, read by all the authorities, Spitta suggests παραδοθειση, as in ii. 21 ἐκ τῆς παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς ἀγίας ἐντολῆς, and Jude 3 τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείση πίστει.

i. 17. φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης αὐτῷ τοιαῦσδε ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης. So all the authorities. It is difficult, however, to see the force of ὑπό, "a voice brought by the excellent glory." We have an example of the proper use of φέρομαι ὑπό just below in v. 21, ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν. Surely the excellent glory is the source,

not the *vehicle* of the voice. I think we should read *ἀπό*.

i. 19. *αυχμηρῶ]* *αχμηρῶ* A 26 *al.* There is the same peculiarity in the *ακαταπαστους* of B in ii. 14, on which see note. Perhaps it originated in faulty pronunciation.

i. 21. *ἀπο θεου* BP + WH Ti, *αγιοι θεου* \aleph KL + Treg, *αγιοι του θεου* A, *αγιοι απο θεου* *al.* Evidently *αγιοι* is a correction, which had the advantage of giving greater prominence to the idea of holiness.

ii. 4. *σειροις* \aleph Ti (*σειροις* ABC Treg), *σειραις* KLP vg +. If *σειραις* were the reading of the archetype, we can hardly conceive its being changed to *σειροῖς*, since the former is the commoner word and is also supported by *δεσμοῖς* in Jude 6. On the other hand, it is difficult to see why the author should prefer to write *σειροῖς*. If he wished to follow Enoch more closely, why should he not have used a Septuagint equivalent, *ἄβυσσος*, *λάκκος* or *βόθυνος*?

ζοφου BCKLP \aleph Ti Treg WH Weiss, *ζοφοις* A S pitta Kühl. The latter reading may have arisen from a marginal *-οις* intended to correct *σειραις*, but wrongly applied to *ζοφου*. Spitta would read *ζοφοῖς* contracted from *ζοφέοις*, but the word itself is very rare, and there is no proof that it was ever contracted.

τηρουμενους BCKLP + Ti Treg WH, *κολαζομενους τηρειν* \aleph A latt Spitta, who rejects the usual explanation that this is an emendation from ver. 9 (the influence would rather have been the other way; ver. 9 would have been altered to agree with ver. 4, but there is no trace of this). On the other hand, there are many examples of recurrent phrase in 2 Pet., e.g. *διεγείρειν ἐν ὑπομνήσει* in i. 13 and iii. 1; *τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες* in i. 20, iii. 3; *ἐξακολουθῶ* in i. 16, ii. 2, 15; *φθορά*, ii. 12 *bis*; *μισθὸν ἀδικίας*, ii. 13, 15; *δελεάζω*, ii. 14, 18; *οὐρανοὶ . . . παρελεύσονται στοιχεῖα δὲ καυσούμενα λυθήσεται* in iii. 10, and *οὐρανοὶ . . . λυθήσονται καὶ στοιχεῖα καυσούμενα τήκεται* in iii. 12. Moreover, the reading of \aleph A is more in harmony with the description in Enoch x. 4, 12,

lxxxviii. 2, where final punishment is preceded by preparatory punishment.

ii. 6. καταστροφή κατεκρινεν & AC²KL Vg + Treg Ti Spitta Weiss v. Soden, *κατεκρινεν* BC WH, *κατεστρεψεν* P. It seems more likely that *καταστροφή* should have been accidentally omitted than inserted. It was a natural word for the author to use, as *καταστρέφω* and *καταστροφή* are used after destruction of Sodom in Genesis xix. 25, 29, Deuteronomy xxix. 23, Isaiah xiii. 19, Jeremiah xxvii. 40, Amos iv. 11. For constr. cf. Mark x. 33, *κατακρινούσιν αὐτὸν θανάτῳ*, Matthew xx. 18 (where B omits *θανάτῳ*), Diod. xiv. 4 *τοὺς πονηροτάτους κατεδίκαζον θανάτῳ*, Ael. V.H. xii. 39 *κατεγνώσθη θανάτῳ*.

ασεβεισιν BP WH, *ασεβειν* & ACKL Vg Treg Ti. The infinitive *ασεβειν* is naturally suggested by *μελλόντων*, but does not give so good a sense as the dat. *ασεβέσιν*. As a rule, *ὑπόδειγμα* takes a genitive of the thing and dat. of the person, as in Sir. 44. 16, *Ἐνὼχ ὑπόδειγμα μετανόιας ταῖς γενεαῖς*; 2 Macc. vi. 31, *τοῖς νέοις ὑπόδειγμα γενναιότητος καταλιπών*; 3 Macc. ii. 5, *παράδειγμα τοῖς ἐπιγινομένοις καταστήσας*. So here it makes much better sense to say "an example (or warning) of things in store for ungodly persons" (cf. Heb. xi. 20, *περὶ μελλόντων εὐλόγησεν*, and *v.l.* on Heb. ix. 11, *τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν*), than to say "an example of persons about to do wrong," which would be better expressed by the simple *παράδειγμα ἀσεβείας*.

ii. 8. ο δικαίος & ACKLP Treg Ti, *οι. ο* B WH. The latter reading gives an easier construction for the datives *βλέμματι καὶ ἰκοῆ*, "righteous in look and in hearing," i.e. he discouraged sin by the expression of his countenance and by refusing to listen to evil. Reading *ὁ δίκαιος*, we should have to govern *βλέμματι* by *ψυχὴν δικαίαν ἐβασάνιζεν*, and to give an unprecedented force to *βλέμματι*, "the righteous man tortured his righteous soul in seeing and hearing because of their lawless deeds"

(cf. Field, *Ot. Norv.* p. 241). Vg (not noticed in Ti) seems to agree with B, "aspectu enim et auditu justus erat habitans apud eos qui de die in diem animam justam iniquis operibus cruciabant."

ii. 11. ου φερουσιν κατ' αυτων παρα κυριω βλασφημον κρισιν ⚭ BCKLP Ti, *om.* παρα κυριω A Vg+, παρα κυριου *minusc. et verss. al.* Spitta, [παρα κυριω] Treg WH. Here *αὐτῶν* refers to *δόξας* (= τῷ διαβόλῳ in ver. 10), and *παρὰ κυρίῳ* refers to *ἀλλὰ εἶπεν Ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι κύριος* in Jude 9. It is implied that reverence for God was the motive which restrained the angel from presumptuous judgment. It is impossible to imagine such a phrase foisted in by a scribe, and its difficulty accounts for its disappearance from A, whereas it is quite in accordance with 2 Peter's remote and abstract way of alluding to what he had before him in Jude. I see no meaning in Spitta's *παρὰ κυρίου*. If it is "from the Lord," how can it be a *βλάσφημος κρίσις*?

ii. 12. ἐν τη φθορα αυτων και φθαρησονται ⚭ ABCP, for *και φθαρ.* KL read *καταφθαρησονται*. If *αὐτῶν* is taken to refer to the *ἄλογα ζῶα*, as is generally done, I should be inclined to prefer *καταφθαρησονται* in spite of the authority for the other reading, as I see no satisfactory explanation of *καί*; but if it is referred to the *κατ' αὐτῶν* of v. 11 and the *δόξας* of v. 10, as I think it should be, *καί* will then mean that the libertines will share the fate of the evil angels.

ii. 13. αδικουμενοι ⚭ BP Syr. Arm. + WH, *κομιουμενοι* ⚭^c ACKL Vg+Tr Treg. The future *κομιούμενοι* is out of place here and can only be regarded as an emendation of the misunderstood *ἀδικούμενοι*, which may be translated "defrauded of the hire of fraud," like Balaam, to whom Balak addressed the words, "God hath kept thee from honour" (Num. xxiv. 11), and who was eventually killed in his attempt to seduce Israel. So here the false teachers will be destroyed before they obtain the honour and popularity which they seek.

εν ταις απαταις αυτων \aleph A¹CKLP +, for απαταις A²BC² Vg have αγαταις. The gen. αὐτῶν proves that ἀπάταις is the right reading. It is in consequence of their wiles that they are admitted to your love feasts. The reading of B is an evident correction from Jude 12. It is one of the curious instances of a change of meaning with very slight variation of sound in passing from Jude to 2 Peter. So σπίλοι and σπιλάδες in the same verse.

ii. 14. ακαταπαυστους \aleph CKLP 13, 31 Ti Treg, ακαταπαστους AB WH. The latter form is unknown in Greek. It is supposed to be derived from a Laconian form πάζω, see under ἀμπάζονται in Herwerden, *Lex. Gr. Suppletorium*, where, after quoting from Hesych. ἀμπ. = ἀναπαύονται, he continues: "fuit ergo verbum Laconicum πάζεν = παύειν." It seems very unlikely that such a form should have found its way into the archetype of 2 Peter. As suggested above (i. 19) on the form ἀχμηρῶ, it may have originated in a faulty pronunciation on the part of the reader, or the υ may have been accidentally omitted at the end of the line, as in B, where one line ends with πα- and the next line begins with -στους. So in v. 21 below, B has lost the last syllable of ἔσχατα at the end of a line. Blass, *Gr. T. Gr.*, p. 44, gives examples of forms in which the υ has been lost, such as ἐπάνη, Herm. *Vis*, i. 33, ἐπαναπαήσεται Luke x. 6, and ἐκάνη from καίω. Cf. *New Sayings of Jesus*, 1, βασιλεύσας ἀναπαήσεται. Schaefer in the Index to Bast's *Comment. Palaeogr.* (*s. au et a confusa*) refers to the reading πίφασκον for πίφανσκον in Hom. *Od.* 12. 165 with Porson's note, and Dr. F. G. Kenyon writes to me that ἑατοῦ and τάτό are not unfrequently found in papyri and inscriptions for ἑαυτοῦ and ταυτό. He also mentions that Ἄγουστος often stands for Ἀὔγουστος in papyri, that two examples of πάω for παύω occur in the *C.I.G.*, viz., 5984 A 3 ἀναπαόμενος and 6595, 4 ἀναπάεται, and refers to a paragraph on the subject in Crönert's *Memoria Herculanensis*, p. 126.

ii. 15. καταλιποντες B³CKLP + Treg WH^m, καταλείποντες **N** AB Ti WH. The aor. seems to be needed here, as the reference is to a fact anterior to the action of the verb ἐπλανήθησαν. For the confusion between ει and ι see my note on ἴδε James iii. 3 and Hort's Introduction, p. 306: "B shows a remarkable inclination to change ι into ει," of which we have the following instances in this epistle, i. 1 ἰσοτειμον, 17 τειμην, 20 and iii. 3 γεινωσκοντες, 21 γεινεται, iii. 1 ειλικρεινη, 8 χειλια bis.

Βοσορ **N**^c ACKLP Ti Treg, Βεωρ B WH Weiss, *Βεωροσορ* **N** (arising from a confusion between *Βοσορ* and the marginal correction *εωρ*). Grove in Smith's *D. of B.* (s.v. Bosor) says: "this is the Aramaic mode of pronouncing the name Beor in accordance with a common Chaldaic substitution" (see Zahn's *Einl. in d. N.T.* ii. p. 110). The support of the ordinary name by B against the other MSS. may be compared with its support of Σίμων against Συμεών in i. 1. It seems to me more probable that an original *Βοσορ* should have been changed to *Βεωρ* than the reverse.

ος μισθον αδικιας ηγαπησεν ACKLP **N**^c WH Ti Treg, μισθον αδικιας ηγαπησαν B Arm. Treg^m WH^m. The objection to the latter reading is that in the next clause (ἐλεγξιν ἔσχεν) we have to revert to the subject Balaam. Possibly an accidental omission of ὅς may account for B's reading.

ii. 18. ολιγως AB **N**^c Vg Treg Ti WH, *οντως* **N** CKLP, *ολιγον minusc. al.* The reading ὄντως (translated "who were clean escaped" in A.V.) seems to involve a self-contradiction after δελεάζουσιν. In the MSS. it is hardly distinguishable from the rare adverb ὀλίγως, which should probably be translated "all but" = ὀλίγον δεῖν. Like ὄντως the reading ὀλίγον, "for a short time," would seem to require the aor. ἀποφυγόντας read by KLP.

iii. 6. δι' ὧν ο τοτε κοσμος υδατι κατακλυσθεις απωλετο.

Commentators explain δι' ὧν as referring to the ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος of the preceding verse, "that there were heavens from of old, and an earth compacted out of water and through water by the word of God." It is very harsh to make two different waters out of two different uses or actions of water, and it is still harsher to repeat ὕδατι in the same clause, "through which (waters) the then world was destroyed by water." Remembering that one of the commonest sources of MS. corruption is the confusion between long and short vowels, I think we should read δι' ὄν with minusc. 31, which would refer to the immediately preceding τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγῳ, and give a much clearer expression to the argument. The world was first created out of water by the Word of God: owing to that same Word it was destroyed by water, and will one day be destroyed by fire.

iii. 7. τῷ αὐτῷ ABP Vg + WH Ti, τῷ αὐτοῦ \aleph CKL Treg Weiss. The former is the far more effective reading, emphasizing the identity of the creative and the destructive Word. If a genitive were wanted, it would have been more natural to repeat Θεοῦ.

iii. 9. εἰς υμᾶς BCP Treg WH Weiss, δι υμᾶς \aleph A Ti Treg^m, εἰς ημᾶς KL. I do not think δι' υμᾶς can be right, as though the delay were for the sake of a single church. Even εἰς ὑμᾶς seems to me to have been rightly corrected to εἰς ἡμᾶς by KL. So in v. 11 below I am inclined to think that ἡμᾶς (read by \aleph) must have been what the author wrote and not the ὑμᾶς of ACKL omitted by B.

iii. 10. ἡμερα κυρίου BC Treg Ti WH, η ημερα K. \aleph AKLP Weiss. The phrase ἡμέρα κυρίου is found without the article in 1 Thess. v. 2. Where ἡ ἡμέρα occurs, as in 2 Th. ii. 2, κυρίου also generally takes the article; cf. below v. 12.

iii. 10. οι ουρανοι ABC Treg WH Weiss, ουρανοι \aleph KL Ti, *add.* μὲν \aleph 13. The anarthrous στοιχεῖα and γῆ which

follow are in favour of the omission of the article. In *v.* 7 the article is required by the following *vñv*.

ευρεθησεται Ɱ BKP, ουχ ευρεθησεται, Sah. Syr. Bdl. ("non invenientur"), κατακαήσεται AL Ti, καθησεται *vel* κατακαυθησονται al., αφανισθησονται C, om. και γη—ευρεθησεται Vg, om. ευρεθησεται spec. Weiss reads *ευρεθησεται* with a question, *ex* ρησεται *corr. putat* H (S.R. p. 103). The phrase *ούχ εύρίσκειται* is used to denote disappearance in Ps. xxxvii. 36, *ούχ εύρέθη ό τόπος αύτου* Job xx. 8, *ώσπερ ένύπνιον έκπετασθεν ού μη εύρεθῆ* Dan. ii. 19, *πεσείται και ούχ εύρεθήσεται* Apoc. xviii. 21. I do not think we can give this force to the simple question, as Weiss. It is plain that the reading of C is merely a conjectural emendation of the hopeless *εύρεθήσεται*. So probably *κατακαήσεται* and the other readings. *καταρνήσεται* would give the required sense, but not, I think, the simple *ρήσεται*. Buttman's suggestion, *à έν αύτῇ έργα εύρεθήσεται*, does not seem to me very felicitous. Dr. Chase thinks that *διαρνήσεται* receives some support from Enoch i. 6, and also that it is nearer to *εύρεθήσεται* than *καταρνήσεται*. He suggests, however, that possibly *ιαθήσεται* or *έξιαθήσεται* may be the true reading, in accordance with the words addressed to Gabriel in Enoch x. 7, *ΐασον τήν γῆν ἦν ήφάνισαν οι έργήγοροι*, and in anticipation of *καινήν γῆν* in ver. 13 below (the three clauses in *vv.* 12*b*, 13, answering to the three clauses in *v.* 10); but he allows that "ver. 11 seems to require some verb implying destruction at the end of ver. 10." Could this be *άρθήσεται*?

iii. 11. Τουτων ουν Ɱ AKL Ti Treg, *τουτων ουτως* B WH Weiss, *τουτων δε ουτως* CP. There seems no special reason for *ούτως*. It is the general fact, not the particular manner of destruction, which has to be insisted on. The reading of C is merely an emendation. Dr. F. G. Kenyon writes that the abbreviations of *ούτως* and *οὖν* are scarcely distinguishable, the former appearing as *ο* in the London

medical papyrus, as δ in the Berlin Didymus papyrus, while $\omicron\delta\nu = \omicron$ in the Aristotle papyrus, and in the Berlin Didymus.

iii. 16. πασαις ταις \aleph KLP Ti, *om.* ταις ABC Treg WH Weiss. "In all letters" seems to me too indefinite; $\tau\alpha\iota\varsigma$ would be easily lost after $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\iota\varsigma$.

Readings of B which are unsupported by other uncial MSS.¹:

β i. 1 Σιμων. α i. 4 τιμια και μεγαιστα ημιν. ? i. 17 ο υιος μου ο αγαπητος μου ουτος εστιν. α ii. 8 ακοη δικαιος. β ii. 15 Βεωρ ηγαπησαν. β ii. 16 ανθρωποις. β ii. 18 ματαιοτης Β', ματαιοτητης Β³. β ii. 20 εσχα. β iii. 5 συνεστωσης. β iii. 11 τουτων ουτως, *om.* υμας. Possibly the pronoun was omitted in the archetype and differently supplied by \aleph and the other MSS.

Readings of B supported by one other uncial MS.:

? i. 18 τω αγιω ορει BC. α i. 21 απο θεου BP. β ii. 6 *om.* καταστροφη BC. β ii. 13 αγαπαις ΒΑ². β ii. 14 ακαταπαστους ΒΑ. β ii. 15 *om.* ος Β Sin. ? ii. 19 τουτω \aleph Β (omitting και). ? ii. 20 κυριου (omitting ημων) ΒΚ. ? ii. 22 κνλισμον BC. α iii. 10 ημερα (omitting η) BC.

Readings of B supported by two other uncial MSS.:

β i. 3 δια δοξης και αρετης ΒΚΛ. ? ii. 4, σειροις ΒΑC. α ii. 12 αδικουμενοι ΒΡ \aleph . ? ii. 15, καταλειποντες ΒΑ \aleph . α ii. 21 υποστρεψαι ΒCΡ. α ii. 22 συμβεβηκεν (omitting δε) ΒΑ \aleph . α iii. 7 τω αυτω ΒΑΡ. β iii. 9, εις υμας ΒCΡ β iii. 10 οι ουρανοι ΒΑC. ? ευρεθησεται ΒΚΡ. β iii. 16 πασαις (omitting ταις) ΒΑC.

¹ I have put α before the readings which seemed to me right, β before those which seemed wrong, ? where I was doubtful.

*ST. JOHN IX. : A FORESHADOWING OF
CHRISTIAN MARTYRDOM.*

Through many tribulations we must enter into the Kingdom of God.

—Acts xiv. 22.

ST. JOHN records very few of the miracles of Jesus Christ, partly no doubt because those which are narrated in the synoptic Gospels would, in his time, be as familiar to the Church as they are now. But another reason may be discerned. The miracles which St. John does record are full of significance, and serve in a special way to bring out the truth of that great principle on which his Gospel is founded, namely that Christ is God, or, as this Evangelist expresses it—the Word is God. The Gospel of St. John is a continuous proof that Jesus Christ is God manifest in the flesh, that He is the Word or revelation of God to man.

In this revelation the miracles recorded by St. John hold an important place. They are manifestations of the creative power of God. They reveal Jesus Christ as God the Creator. For this reason miracles are throughout this Gospel invariably called signs. They are signs of the Godhead.

This special characteristic is discernible in the first miracle at the marriage feast in Cana, and in the miracle of feeding the five thousand, and in the raising of Lazarus from the dead.

It is the meaning also of the miracle recorded in the ninth chapter of the Gospel. Jesus Christ teaches expressly that the healing of the blind man was “in order that the works of God should be made manifest in him” (ch. ix. 3) just as He teaches that the sickness of Lazarus was “not unto death, but for the glory of God, that the Son of God may be glorified thereby” (ch. xi. 4). See also chap. ii. 11.

But the glory of God in Christ was not only manifested

in the cure of the blind man as an act of Divine power. It was manifested also in the significance of the whole incident, occurring as it does in a strongly marked crisis in the ministry of Christ, and in His relations with Judaism. It is an incident which, taken in connexion with the preceding narrative and with the "Shepherd" parables which follow, is not only typical of the foundation of the Church, but in a true sense is the foundation and beginning of the Church; while the blind beggar, who received the gift of sight, was also in a real sense the first Christian martyr and confessor, and the first example of individual Christian experience.

That it was a marked crisis in the ministry of Christ on earth is made clear by the closing passage of the eighth chapter. Jesus had been preaching in the temple publicly for the last time to His nation. Of those who listened "many believed on Him" (v. 30), others less definitely "believed Him" (v. 31); and how uninstructed and weak their belief was is shown by the words which follow, and their readiness to quarrel with the teaching of Christ (vv. 33 *fol.*). The scene ended with a clear assertion by Christ of His Divine nature, and by a violent rejection of that claim by His own people; "they took up stones to cast at Him" (v. 59).

This decisive act gives a character to all that follows: "Jesus went out of the temple" (v. 59). It was the parting of Christ from Judaism. For in Judaism there was no room for the true Christ.

The portrait drawn by the Evangelist of the blind beggar in the ninth chapter is one of the most remarkable and vivid in the Bible. The circumstances of the case are in many ways unique; the questions which it raises are of great interest; and the light which it throws on our Lord's way of dealing with the souls of men is very suggestive and consoling.

The man "blind from his birth," like the man "lame from his mother's womb" (Acts iii. 2), was probably seated at one of the temple gates. Possibly Jesus had often passed him, for the hour was not yet come for his healing. Now Jesus "saw him"; and there was something in His look which drew the attention of His disciples. They asked their Master a question, which was perhaps often mooted in the rabbinical schools: "Who did sin, this man or his parents, that he should be born blind?" It was a question which suggested the thought that suffering must be the result of sin, possibly even prænatal sin. The answer of Jesus dispels that theory once and for ever by these simple words: "Neither did this man sin nor his parents." Never again can it be assumed that human suffering is always or necessarily the result of sin.

But in truth a much more interesting and practical question is raised and largely solved by this sign; namely, what is the secret of infirmity and suffering for the individual Christian? It is a wonderful revelation, which we must accept in faith on the word of Christ, that the ultimate and final cause of this man's life-long physical infirmity was for the glory of God. There was destined to be through him, and as a direct consequence of his visitation, a marvellous manifestation of Divine power; and a further trial of endurance on his part,—experience of a different form of suffering,—was destined to have further results of infinite value to the Church of Christ.

This then was the key of explanation to those years of blindness, and inability to see the sun, and the beauty of created things, and the faces of friends.

Is there not some consolation here for those lifelong sufferers who seem to be hindered and baffled in their work, and aspirations to do some great thing for the cause of Christ, who *seem* to be hindered and made comparatively useless, but who know not that their affliction is for the

glory of God, that the works of God should be made manifest in them?

Another noticeable preliminary point is that this man gives no sign of that faith which in the synoptic Gospels appears to be a necessary condition of a miracle. The synoptic miracles are wrought for the deepening of faith, this miracle is a sign of the glory of God; and the individual human interest of it lies in the awakening and growth of the man's dormant faith. He had not heard of Jesus as a Divine Saviour, or as the Christ. To him He is simply "the man called Jesus." He makes no appeal as Bartimæus and others did to the compassion of the Healer passing by.¹ The great gift comes unexpectedly and unsought. We are not even told in this instance that Jesus was "moved with compassion."

But although, as we have seen, Jesus does not appear to have exacted the condition of faith before working His miracle, when He had anointed the eyes of the blind man with clay, he bids him go and wash in the Pool of Siloam, and the man obeyed. Something in the word or act of Jesus inspired faith. And faith met with its reward. "He came seeing."

At this point, in a synoptic Gospel, the account of the miracle might have closed. With St. John the deeper interest and instructiveness of it begin, in the study of character which follows, in the description of the intensified conflict between Christ and Judaism, and its relation to Christian martyrdom.

At first the reality of the cure is questioned, just as in the case of the lame man at the beautiful gate of the temple, cured by the apostles, the recognition was gradual (*ἐπεγίνωσκον*, Acts iii. 10); so here there was at first a doubt, which is removed by the man's avowal. Instantly he is questioned by his neighbours: "How were thine eyes

¹ Matt. ix, 27, xx. 30.

opened?" It is observable that in his answer he does not go a hair's breadth beyond the fact. With admirable clearness he answers the question so far as he can. But he makes no inference; expresses no wonder, or even gratitude. He speaks of his Healer merely as "the man that is called Jesus"; and where He is he knows not.

And now an incident occurs which indicates the immense influence of the Pharisees, and their hostility to Jesus. "The man who was called Jesus" was to them a great deal more than He was to the man healed of his blindness. He was One who had made the awful claim to be the Christ or Messiah of the Jews. Moreover He had denounced with great severity the religious teaching of the Pharisees. Consequently in their bitter hostility the Pharisees threatened with expulsion from the synagogue any one who should acknowledge Jesus to be the Christ (*v.* 22).

The cured blind man was a dangerous witness to the claim of Jesus to be the Son of God. And so when he is brought before those prejudiced and hostile judges, and has told his wonderful story with even greater simplicity and directness (*v.* 15), he is confronted with men who, to use a phrase of modern controversy, employed authority to stifle truth. "Give glory to God," they said. "We know that this man is a sinner."

Up to this time the man did not make, or at least give utterance to, any inferences.¹ But the opposition is a good thing for him. It made him bold. He still rested on his experience, and held firmly to what he knew. And so he answered the inquisitors: "Whether He be a sinner I know not; one thing I know, that whereas I was blind now I see" (*v.* 25). And then when further pressed he turns upon his adversaries with the taunt: "Why, herein is the marvel

¹ It is noticeable that the name "Christ" is not mentioned either by the man or his parents. There is a union of straightforwardness and caution in both, which is characteristic of a true portrait.

that ye"—the teachers of Israel—"know not whence He is, and yet He hath opened mine eyes" (v. 30). Then he is led on to a deeper inference still—He must be from God: "Since the world began it was never heard that any one opened the eyes of a man born blind. If this man were not from God, He could do nothing" (vv. 32, 33).

The only answer to this was the answer of the persecutor in every age—the answer of unreasoning hate and defeated argument: "Thou wast altogether born in sins, and dost thou teach us? And they cast him out" (v. 34).

It was a terrible sentence. For "an excommunicated man was like one dead. He was not allowed to study with others, no intercourse was to be held with him, he was not even to be shown the road. He might indeed buy the necessaries of life, but it was forbidden to eat or drink with such an one."¹

We must remember too that this man was miserably poor. He had lived upon alms. Now no one could come near him. He would be treated as a leper. He was ruined, just at the moment too when the brightness of life seemed to have dawned upon him. He may well have been in despair.

Then it was, in his extremity and loneliness, that Jesus found him. Through persecution he had been led to the knowledge of Christ. And so he was prepared for the revelation of Jesus; "He it is that speaketh with thee" (v. 37).

It is a story of conversion, or, shall we say, of conviction? which has no exact parallel in the Bible. On one other occasion only, during His ministry on earth, did Jesus openly and unreservedly declare Himself to be the Christ.²

¹ Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, ii. 184.

² The declaration of Messiahship as understood by His judges (Matt. xxvi. 64) stands in a different relation, and is not parallel to the two instances given above.

He gave to the woman of Samaria and to this disciple alone the answer which He denied to the Jews, who asked Him: "If Thou art the Christ, tell us plainly."¹ And for this reason. The Christ of the popular imagination was not the true Christ, to whom the works of Jesus bore witness (see chap. x. 24). To the Jews, therefore, the declaration, "I that speak unto you am He," would have been misleading. Not so to this new disciple, or to the Samaritan woman. So far as their conception of the Christ went it was a true conception. And each is a striking instance of the way in which the works of Christ do testify of Him.

In the case which we are considering, the man's religious life and his faith in Christ were founded on the knowledge of the wonderful work which had been wrought in him. It was a twofold work—a work of healing, and a work of conversion; each divine, and each a work of creative power. Therefore He who wrought it must be God. And so those long dreary years of blindness did not only prove an inestimable blessing to this man's soul, but through that suffering and loss of the fair light of heaven he was privileged to be an instrument for the manifestation of the glory of God.

There is a sense in which this man was the first Christian—the first follower of Christ who had wholly severed his connexion with Judaism, whose religious life was now centred on Christ alone, whose faith was grounded on a direct revelation by the witness of Christ Himself to his soul.

And in a twofold sense he was the first martyr or witness for Christ, first, unconsciously through his years of blindness; secondly, consciously by his testimony before the Pharisees, and by suffering the terrible sentence of excommunication. And as he was doubly a martyr or confessor

¹ St. John x. 24.

of Christ, his story gives a twofold example and encouragement. It will help the Christian disciple in every age to endure bravely and patiently whatever suffering he may be called upon to bear, knowing that in some way Christ may be manifested even in His disciple's sufferings. And, again, it will encourage the Christian to be bold in the confession of faith, even at the risk of unpopularity and alienation of friends. In that moment of isolation and despair Christ will *find* His own disciple, and will manifest Himself in the power and tenderness of the Son of God.

ARTHUR CARR.

*THE LIFE OF CHRIST ACCORDING TO ST.
MARK.¹*

XXXI. LAST DAYS IN GALILEE, IX. 30-50.¹

JESUS' recent experiences had all been preparing the way for the declaration of His Messiahship and the tragic end of His ministry. But His hour had not yet come; He had chosen the ensuing Passover at Jerusalem as the occasion of His sacrifice, in order that the vast assembly of Jewish pilgrims might be witnesses, and that the place and time might help to set forth the significance of the crowning act of His life. But some considerable interval had still to elapse before the Passover, and it might seem at first sight as if Peter's confession, the Transfiguration, and the announcement of the Passion had brought matters to a crisis with the disciples prematurely. Jesus had resolved on a step which must lead to His death; He had solemnly pledged Himself to the disciples, and yet weeks must intervene before He could give effect to His resolution. This long suspense would dissipate any energy due merely to moments of highly wrought enthusiasm; the fervour of excitement would disappear as day after day went by, and Jesus again and again contemplated in cold blood the grim realities of His future. Yet He went forward without haste and without hesitation, still quietly preparing for His decisive visit to Jerusalem. His Sacrifice was deliberate, premeditated, prepared for and waited for in the abiding strength of God.

This last journey took Him in the first instance through Galilee, and in the course of it He visited Capernaum. He kept His movements secret, lest He should fall into the

¹ These studies are not a complete doctrinal or historical account of Christ, but simply an attempt to set forth the impression which the Gospel of St. Mark, taken by itself, would make upon a reader who had no other source of information.

hands of His enemies, and His plans should be thwarted: "He desired that no one should know" that He was in Galilee. He now wandered a proscribed fugitive, where He had once been the idol of admiring crowds. In this nadir of His fortunes the most trifling token of faith or kindly feeling was welcome, and was counted as meritorious. John told Him of an exorcist who cast out demons by His name, not through any spiritual faith, but because he regarded the Name as a potent spell. He had refused to associate himself with the disciples, and they had forbidden him to use the Name. But Jesus answered them, "Do not hinder him; no one is likely to do a mighty work in My name, and then speak evil of Me. Every one who is not against you is for you." Time had been when Jesus sat at rich men's feasts, but now a cup of water bestowed on one of His followers for His sake would deserve gratitude and recompense.

In this desperate extremity, the sole gleam of comfort came, strangely enough, from the selfish ambition of the disciples. They might misunderstand their Master, but they still believed in Him; they were still so confident about the coming of the Kingdom, that they thought it worth while to dispute who should be the greatest in the new era. At that time, most men with any reputation for practical good sense would have laughed contemptuously at such aspirations, and bidden the disciples "dispute, more reasonably wrong, the ordering of a shipwreck."

Nevertheless these days were no mere period of painful suspense; Jesus still laboured anxiously to prepare His disciples for the end. The only reason which St. Mark expressly gives for secrecy is that He desired to teach the disciples concerning His death and resurrection; but, adds the Evangelist, "they did not understand, and were afraid to ask." Instead of asking, they left Jesus to Himself, and recurred amongst themselves, as we have seen, to the more

congenial topic of the relative dignity of the high offices they were to fill in the kingdom. Jesus, however, was not so preoccupied with His own fortunes as to overlook their dispute. When they reached their lodging, He asked them what they had been discussing, and they were ashamed to tell Him; nevertheless He decided their controversy thus: "If any man desire to be first, he shall be last of all, and servant of all."

St. Mark gives in this connexion certain sayings about children. Jesus took a little child, set him in the midst, and took him in His arms and said, "He who receives a little child like this in My name receives Me, and he who receives Me, receives not Me, but Him that sent Me." Further on, separately, "If any one cause one of the little ones who believe on Me to stumble, it were better for him if a great millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were cast into the sea." This act and these sayings may be symbolic; the child and the believing little ones may represent humble, simple-minded believers in contrast to the Apostles, who were clear that they were great, and only doubtful which was the greatest. Or the second saying may be quite independent, and have no reference to the dispute as to who was greatest. The "believing little ones" may describe the disciples generally as men of small account in the world's esteem. But it would be quite in accordance with St. Mark's description of the character and teaching of Jesus to understand these sayings literally of children. Here and elsewhere we see that Jesus was fond of children, and they must have been fond of Him; they could not have resisted His winsomeness. In these dark days the persecuted Prophet found much comfort in the artless and affectionate confidence of children, and His thoughts turned to their part in the kingdom. He was not thinking of the acceptance of doctrines as to His person and work; the "belief" of "the little ones" was

their trustful love for Him. He was indignant at the possibility that they might be turned away from the kingdom, perhaps by the selfish harshness of His own disciples, and He bade them receive children as they would receive their Master, or even God Himself. In the record as St. Mark gives it, the Apostles are rebuked by the contrast between their contentious ambition and a child's disinterested affection.

St. Mark assigns other sayings to this last visit to Galilee; we cannot be sure of their connexion, as they are arranged on mnemonic principles, a group about stumbling-blocks, and another whose key-words are "salt," and "fire." Again, Jesus insists that loyalty to Himself may demand the most painful sacrifices—hand, foot, or eye—yet it is better to endure such losses than to be shut out of the kingdom, and cast into "Gehenna, the unquenchable fire, where the worm never dies." His anticipations of coming trial which may purify and redeem is also expressed in the words, "Everything must be salted with fire"; and by a verbal connexion we have a saying that "Salt is good, but if the salt have become saltless, wherewith shall ye season it?" If the Apostles, who were to be ministers of redemption, fell away, how could they be redeemed? The section ends with a reference to the dispute on the way to Capernaum, "Be at peace with one another."

The brief record of the last visit to Galilee reflects in every phrase the anxiety and gloom of those days, and the calm persistence with which Jesus prepared for His final entry into Jerusalem.

XXXII. THE MINISTRY BEYOND THE JORDAN, X. 1-31.

After a while Jesus left Galilee, and crossing the Jordan came to the Eastern districts opposite Judæa. He now felt safer than in Galilee. The Eastern borderlands were

less settled : the population was largely Gentile, and partly under the direct government of Rome. There was less opportunity for official persecution or popular fanaticism, and the desert offered a refuge from danger. Hence Jesus resumed His public ministry. Once more crowds gathered round Him, and He taught them after His old fashion. Thus the coming of the Kingdom was proclaimed in yet another district¹ of the Holy Land. The reminiscences of this ministry are brief, fragmentary, and disconnected accounts of special episodes. Doubtless the burden of His public preaching was the same as in earlier days. We have recorded

(a) *A Discussion with the Pharisees as to Divorce*, 2-12. It soon appeared that Jesus' enemies had not forgotten Him in His period of retirement ; Pharisees soon appeared again amongst His hearers, and sought to draw from Him heretical utterances which might furnish grounds of accusation. Indiscriminate divorce was as great an evil amongst the Jews of those days as it is in some of the United States to-day ; and Jesus, apparently, had spoken strongly against this abuse. The practice was justified by giving a very wide interpretation to the ordinance.² "When a man hath taken a wife, and married her, and she find no favour in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her : then let him write her a bill of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house. When she has left his house, she may go and marry another man." Hence the Pharisees approached Him on this subject in the confident hope of eliciting some blasphemous³ criticism of the Law. They were not disappointed. They asked Him in the first instance if divorce were lawful ; and He referred them to Moses. "Moses," said they, "directed that a bill

¹ As far as St. Mark's narrative is concerned.

² Deuteronomy xxiv. 1.

³ From their point of view.

of divorce should be written, and the woman put away." Jesus in fact had played into their hands by His question ; any condemnation of divorce now would be a deliberate and avowed contradiction of Moses—at least so it seemed. But Jesus answered, " Moses wrote this ordinance with a view to your hardness of heart," but the story of the Creation, He continued, shows that the union of man and woman in marriage was an act of God, which man must not undo.

Since Jesus had repudiated the Mosaic law of clean and unclean meats, He had thought out the principle which enabled Him to accept the Pentateuch as a Divine Revelation, and yet to annul it. The Law was a temporary provision for an imperfect people ; not, as the Jews proudly believed, the eternal glory and privilege of Israel, but in some respects the brand of their shame. Ordinances ethically defective implied moral inferiority in the people ; they were incapable of appreciating or profiting by any higher law. Thus the honour of Moses was saved at the expense of Israel and the Law ; nevertheless, the blasphemy was equally horrible in the eyes of the Pharisees.

When He and His disciples were again alone together, He formulated His views in express contradiction to Deuteronomy, " Whosoever putteth away his wife and marrieth another, committeth adultery with her : and if a wife putteth away her husband, and is married to some one else, she committeth adultery."

(b) *Jesus blesses Children*, 13–16. The next incident confirms what was said in the last section of Jesus and children. Some little children, hardly more than babies, were brought to Him that He might touch them ; the touch of so great a prophet would have magic in it, and make them strong and healthy. But the Apostles intervened ; the renewed popularity of Jesus' ministry made

them more certain than ever that the manifestation of His Messianic glory was near at hand ; and it was beneath the dignity of the Messiah that He should be troubled by the foolish importunity of fond parents. But Jesus was vexed at the mistaken zeal of His followers, and said, "Suffer the little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdom of God ; verily, I say unto you, no one shall enter into the Kingdom of God, who does not receive it as a little child." And He took them in His arms and laid His hands on them, and blessed them.

(c) *A Rich Man refuses to make such Sacrifice as had been made by the Apostles, 17-31.* The next episode is one of the few recorded interviews between Jesus and men of wealth and position. Once, as Jesus and His disciples were starting out for their day's journey, they were arrested by a man who came running in eager haste, lest Jesus should have departed before he could reach Him. Experience suggested that he was the friend of some sufferer, and came to beg Jesus to perform an act of healing. But no, for the first time in the narrative we hear of some one seeking spiritual teaching. The man fell on his knees and asked, "Good Teacher, what am I to do to inherit eternal life?" Somehow the word "good" jarred upon Jesus. "Why," said He, "do you call me 'good' ? No one is good except one, God." Probably the word in the man's mouth was a mere conventional courtesy. Had it been intended in its full sense, it would have implied a recognition of the Messiahship, the Divine Sonship of Jesus ; His question was perhaps meant to elicit a confession of faith in His mission. But possibly special stress was laid upon "good," such as might be represented by "Teacher, holy, saintly man !" The better anyone is, the less he tolerates such forms of address. There is no question of the low moral standard of sinlessness in its popular meaning of

freedom from positive wrongdoing. But men of high spiritual attainments, because they are advanced and exalted, see infinite possibilities still before them; so that to accept the epithet "good" in its absolute sense would be a despairing denial of their own spiritual future.

But Jesus' words about Himself met with no response; and He went on at once to deal with the inquirer's question: "Thou knowest the commandments, Do not commit adultery; do not murder; do not steal; do not bear false witness; defraud not; honour thy father and mother"—another challenge to faith, "You know the Law; has it failed to help you, and are you seeking from Me the help which the Law cannot give?" "Teacher," the man answered, "I have observed all these from my youth"; admitting, therefore, that the Law had failed, and implying that Jesus might be a source of larger truth and grace. Something in his tone and manner touched the heart of Jesus, and looking intently at him, He loved him. Since the early days of His ministry, He had not addressed to any one the special call to join the inner circle of His followers, the Apostles; but this man had so won Him that He bade him supply the one thing that was lacking, which the Law had not been able to do for him, by selling his property, distributing it to the poor, and joining the followers of Jesus. By so doing he would secure treasure in heaven; but in accepting discipleship he would be taking up his cross. The one thing he lacked was personal surrender to Jesus, whereby he would secure an entrance into the Kingdom of God, wherein alone there was eternal life. The call to apostleship involved the abandonment of worldly goods for him, as for the original Twelve; but the condition was emphasized because he was rich, and such a sacrifice meant much more to him than it did to them. Moreover the invitation was a call to martyrdom; Jesus was going consciously and deliberately to His death; His

movements were no longer secret; He again courted publicity, and seemed to have entered on a triumphal progress to Jerusalem. Once more His enemies dogged His steps, and observed His sayings and doings with malignant eyes. His followers, men would suppose, must share His fate; and even if there was some chance that obscure Galileans might escape, this new and distinguished convert who had joined Jesus after his public repudiation of the Law, this wealthy proprietor from the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, would be a marked man. His acceptance of Jesus' call would indeed have been taking up his cross; and on the way to the scaffold a man may cheerfully distribute his possessions among the crowd. But the Teacher and His would-be disciple were at cross purposes. Jesus spoke in the light of His coming death and its consequences to His followers; but the rich man, like the Apostles, understood nothing of this. He had come to a great prophet, popular and influential, who might possibly be the Messiah, so that suggestions of imminent calamity fell upon unheeding ears. All that he grasped was that the sacrifice of all he had was demanded as the price of eternal life; and as he listened his countenance fell, and he went away disappointed, for he was very wealthy.

Meanwhile the disciples stood by, watching the scene with eager interest. Hitherto the followers of Jesus had consisted of the poor and people of the lower middle-class; now, it seemed, they might be reinforced by a wealthy convert, a valuable accession, and also a dangerous competitor for leadership. But Jesus had imposed difficult conditions, and the possible recruit was lost; and the Master looked round on His disciples, and said, "How hard it is for those who have property to enter into the Kingdom of God." And the disciples were astonished; in this life entrance into the best society is easy for the rich. Jesus explained further, "Children, how hard it is for those

who put their trust in riches to enter into the Kingdom of God. It is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of God." The disciples were still more astonished—they seem to have been brought up to respect wealthy men—"Who then," said they, "can be saved?" Jesus, however, explained that He did not mean literally that no rich man could be saved, humanly speaking it was impossible, but might be accomplished by the special grace of God, for all things were possible with God. By this time the disciples had begun to consider the matter from the point of view of their own personal merits; and Peter said, "Behold, we gave up everything, and followed Thee." If this new comer has not faith enough in his "good Teacher" to sacrifice his wealth, you still have the devoted followers who did not hesitate to leave for your sake boats and nets, and comfortable posts in the custom house.

Jesus answered, "Verily I say unto you, there is no one who for my sake, and for the sake of the Good Tidings, has left house, or brothers, or sisters, or father, or mother, or children, who shall not receive a hundredfold now at this time," in this present dispensation, "houses, brethren, sisters, mothers, children, and lands, with persecutions, and in the coming age," the new dispensation, "eternal life." The wording of this answer shows that it is not a commercial contract guaranteeing a certain profit; the loss of a mother cannot literally be compensated for by the gift of a hundred mothers; and the victims of persecution would not be left in possession of hundreds of houses and estates. There is a note of grave irony, as if Jesus discerned that Peter's anxiety lest his material sacrifices should be forgotten was partly inspired by the hope of material compensation. He had been trying for weeks to prepare His disciples for His coming death; and their insistence on the cost of their loyalty struck a harsh and

discordant note. It was as if on the eve of Thermopylæ the Spartans had clamoured to Leonidas for arrears of pay. Yet Jesus had answered with kindly forbearance, and veiled His rebuke in enigmatic language whose meaning only slowly dawned on His hearers. Indeed we have no complete solution of the enigma now. The general sense, however, is clear, "Do not be afraid that you have made a bad bargain; even now, in the midst of presecution, you have a larger enjoyment of the ordinary blessings of life than you could have derived from the good things you have sacrificed; and you shall have that eternal life which the rich man sought but was not willing to purchase at the expense of his wealth." But He ended with a word of frank warning, "Many that are first shall be last; and the last first."

W. H. BENNETT.

STUDIES IN THE FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN.

V.

THE INADMISSIBILITY OF SIN.

Every one that doeth sin, doeth also lawlessness ;

Indeed sin is lawlessness.

And you know that He was manifested, that He might take away sins ;

And sin in Him there is not.

Every one that abides in Him, sins not :

Every one that sins, has not seen Him nor come to know Him.

Little children, let no one deceive you :

He that doeth righteousness is righteous, according as He is righteous :

He that doeth sin is of the Devil,—for from the beginning the Devil sins ;

For this end the Son of God was manifested, that He might undo the works of the Devil.

Every one that is begotten of God, does no sin,

Because His seed abides in him :

Indeed he cannot sin, because he has been begotten of God.

In this the children of God are manifest,—and the children of the Devil :

Every one that doeth not righteousness, is not of God ;

And he that loves not his brother.

—1 *John* iii. 4-10.

THE Church of the first age lived in expectation of the return of the Lord Jesus from heaven. At any hour He might “be manifested” (ii. 28, iii. 2), to the shame or glory of His servants. This *ἀποκαταδοκία*, as the Apostle Paul called it (Rom. viii. 19), the uplifted head and the far-off wistful look of the Bride waiting for her Lord, was the attitude maintained by the Christian communities amongst which St. John laboured in the closing decades of the first century, as it had been in the Pauline communities of its middle period. The expectancy was not so vivid and absorbing as at an earlier time—the strain had been too intense for continuance—but it remained; and the hope of the Parousia constituted a settled factor of the Christian life; it sustained the lofty motives for fidelity and spiritual aspiration to which the Apostle John appeals

in the paragraph discussed in the last of these Studies (ii. 28—iii. 3). For one who believes in Jesus Christ as his Saviour and Judge, the desire to win His acceptance and appear before Him with confidence at His coming furnishes an incentive to worthiness of life as powerful and honourable as any that the heart can cherish. This motive St John regarded as well-grounded, though he appeals to it but rarely, and as indispensable for his "little children."

1. The hope of the Christian, based on his Lord's definite promise, is to see Him in His state of heavenly glory. Now that implies, the Apostle has asserted, a likeness of character, a moral congruity and conformity between the see-er and the Seen. Vision, in the spiritual sphere, turns upon sympathy, affinity. There is a correlation and pre-adjustment between the eye and the light; the sun finds itself mirrored in the optic instrument. Those who expect to "see Christ as He is," make their account therefore with "being like Him" and aim at this: the latter is the pre-condition of the former; he who seeks Christ as his goal, takes Him for his way and studies to "walk even as He walked" (iii. 2 f., ii. 6). But the "confidence" of the Christian at the Parousia may be turned to confusion and shame (ii. 28); his "hope" awakens a *fear* lest he should be found unlike his Saviour, and so debarred from the sight of His glory—a fear which is the other side of our great hope, the hope translated into negative terms. In this association of ideas the tacit connexion lies between verses 3 and 4, between the paragraph of encouragement in prospect of Christ's coming (ii. 28—iii. 3) and that of warning against the deceitfulness of sin, which is its sequel (iii. 4–10). That connexion is aptly expressed by the language of 2 Peter iii. 14: "Wherefore, beloved, as you expect these things, give diligence to be found in peace without spot and without reproach before Him."

The last section, accordingly, supplies by implication a

motive against moral declension that is amongst the strongest present to the Christian mind, viz. that it will rob the servant of Christ of his dear reward; it cuts him off from the hope of participating in his Lord's assured victory and entering His eternal kingdom. In a word, *sin is ruinous*; it destroys the Christian man's future, and turns the salvation he looked for into perdition. This is the first of five reasons which the Apostle has to give his little children in this context why they should not sin. The other four follow in the verses before us,—which are so many “Checks to Antinomianism,”¹ so many darts aimed by St. John's powerful hand at sin in believers. The whole passage is a keen and concise demonstration of the inadmissibility of sin. In the first sentence of chap. ii., “My little children, these things I am writing to you so that you may not sin,” the Apostle acknowledged his fear on this account and indicated one chief intention governing the whole Epistle. The present section of the letter shows how deeply this purpose entered into his thoughts, and how grave the danger was lest the Church, infected with Gnostic errors of doctrine, should be tainted at the same time with Antinomian corruptions of life. He makes out that on every ground it is impossible for the followers of Jesus Christ and children of God to acquiesce in sin,—in any kind or any degree thereof.

2. If the first reason against a Christian's sinning, implicitly contained in verse 3, was that the act is ruinous to his eternal prospects, the second, very explicitly stated in verse 4, is that *sin is illegal*: “Every one who commits sin, commits also lawlessness; indeed, sin is lawlessness.”

This seems to us a commonplace, the predicate adding nothing to the content of the subject in the sentence

¹ The title of Fletcher of Madeley's polemic on the subject of Holiness, one of the classics of Methodism.

ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνομία, or to its dehortatory force. The word "sin" carries, to our conscience, a fuller and more pregnant sense than "illegality" or "breach of law." Not so with the original readers. Ἄμαρτία, "missing the mark," did not convey in common Greek speech a uniform nor very strong moral significance; it might mean no more than a *mistake*, a fault of ignorance or unhappy fortune, to be pitied rather than severely condemned. This is one of the many Greek Christian words which contracted a new religious stamp and depth of intension from the Septuagint. As the rendering of the Hebrew חַטָּאת, ἁμαρτία became something much graver than before—more serious exactly in the sense and degree in which the faith of Israel was more serious and morally earnest than Greek Paganism and humanism. "Sin," it is said, is a creation of the Bible. Etymologically, this is perfectly true. For the Bible has interpreted, has given voice and vocabulary to the stifled conscience of mankind. Paralysed and half-articulate, its moral consciousness could not even *name* the evil that crushed it. "The knowledge of sin," which, as St. Paul says, "came through the law," was a condition precedent to its removal. Sin must be known, to be hated; defined, that it may be denounced and done away. It had to be identified, distinguished from the man himself, recognized in its abnormal character and referred to its alien origin. And this was a first necessity of revelation, a task in which the supernatural help of the Spirit of truth and of God was indispensable.

The Apostle, in saying "Sin is lawlessness," virtually affirms also that "Lawlessness is sin." His proposition is convertible; the predicate (ἡ ἀνομία) as well as the subject (ἡ ἁμαρτία) is written with the Greek article of definition: the two terms cover the same ground, since they denote the same thing and define it from different sides. The Bible knows of no dividing line between the religious and

the ethical. Since man was created in the image of God and the end of his life is determined by God, then every lapse from that end, every moral aberration (*ἁμαρτία*), is an act of rebellion and a violation of the constitutional laws of human nature (*ἀνομία*). This equation is fixed by the intrinsic spiritual affinity of our being to the Divine. The heathen regarded God, or the gods, as like earthly potentates, beings external to ourselves possessing certain rights over us, and dictating certain duties and prescriptions for us as it might please themselves. If we give them their dues, if we observe the ceremonial rules of religion and conform to the laws of the State imposed under their sanction, they are satisfied. With our private morals and the inner condition of our hearts they have nothing to do: that is our own affair. Individual thinkers, here or there, might rise above the attitude described; but it was the general tendency of Pagan thought to externalize religion in this way and to divorce morality and piety.

Ethical philosophy was developed by the Greeks upon naturalistic premises, quite apart from theology; and it suffers to this day from the want of a supernatural basis, from the attempts, continually repeated, to form a complete, self-contained ethical theory, without regard to the religious bearing and implications of moral phenomena, and to frame an ideal of human character and a norm of human duty in which God has no place. The same artificial separation was carried out in another sense by Jewish Pharisaism. Outward and ostensible acts of sin, formal transgressions of Divine law, indictable offences, were rigidly eschewed by men of corrupt hearts, who found means of committing all kinds of wrong and vileness in evasion of the spirit and intent of the law whose letter they worshipped and kept with punctilious exactness, and which they fenced with innumerable added regulations designed to ward off the most distant possibility of infraction. A man might sin, it

was supposed, might be morally culpable and contemptible, while he broke no law of God ; or he might exempt himself from Divine chastisement by rendering a legal satisfaction which had no ethical value whatever and in no way touched the heart. God's law was reduced to a matter of forensic definition and technical jurisprudence, with which "righteousness, mercy, and faith" had very little to do.

These sophistries, whether Jewish in their conception or, in the case of the readers, more probably Pagan, St. John traverses, cutting clean across the whole web of error when he writes : " Whosoever doeth sin, doeth also lawlessness." The teaching of the New Testament deepens the conception of *sin*, as being a fatal lapse from God and from man's true end posited in God ; it broadens the conception of *law*, as that proceeds from the character of God and regulates man's entire being, in spirit and in body, with all its ongoings and outcome, finding in written codes only an approximate expression ; and thus it brings the two conceptions into the same plane and makes them coincide. Every deviation from the right, every moral error and flaw, every wrong thing done or but conceived in the heart, is opposed to the sovereignty of God and to the revealed law of our nature as men. This is the fundamental and (as one may say) *constitutional* objection to sin. It is condemned by the law of the universe.

3. In verses 5-7 St. John goes on to say that *sin is unchristian*. Here again we must put ourselves back into the position of the readers, if we are not to make the Apostle write mere truisms. They had things to learn which we have been learning for many centuries, and to unlearn evil prejudices and presumptions that were their second nature. The current religions rested on non-ethical conceptions ; their gods and prophets were not distinguished by any great severity against sin or any strict separation from it on their own part. To the Paganism of the age it was a new and

amazing sort of message, to be told of a God who "is light, and in whom is no darkness at all." Now the same thing is said, in the emphatic and precise declaration of verses 5 and 7, respecting the Divine Messenger who brings the tidings, and who is the Word of life and Son of God (i. 1, 7), through whom God in His true self is known to us. The Channel of the new life is as pure as its Source. All Christians "know" this to be so, and are bound by their knowledge to the complete abjuring of sin. "You *know* that He was manifested (ἐκείνος ἐφανερώθη: the distinctive pronoun points, as it did in verse 3 and in ii. 6, and again in verse 7 below, to the historical Jesus) to take away sins." St. John has twice said, "If He should be manifested," in thinking of Christ's expected second revelation in that body of glory to which all the sons of God are to be conformed; but "He *has been* manifested"—a great, decisive appearance of the Son of God has taken place; and that appearance of the Divine in our flesh was God's demonstration made against sin. He was sent to abolish sin and rid the human race of it,—to take it clean away: ἵνα τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἄρῃ. Christ and sin are utter contraries, fatal antagonists: each means the death of the other.

For αἶρειν τὰς ἁμαρτίας signifies more than the (sacrificial) bearing of sins; it adds to this the idea of removal. The Sin-bearer lifts the load and take its weight upon Him, not to let the burden fall again with renewed force upon its victims, but to carry it right off and make an end of it. "He hath been manifested," as another writer puts it, "once for all at the consummation of the ages, for the abolition of sins through His sacrifice" (Heb. ix. 26). According to the double sense of נָשָׂא with נִשְׂאָה or יָנַע, αἶρω in such connexion has this two-fold sense. Herein lie the glory and completeness of Christ's redemption. The cross destroys both the guilt and power of sin; righteousness is imputed and implanted in one act. It seems, however, that

St. John does not credit this undoing of sin to the sacrifice of Calvary by itself, but to the entire incarnate revelation; for the verb *ἐφανερώθη* is unqualified, just as it was in ch. i. 2, and the whole appearance, character and action of the Son of God made man were directed to counterwork and overthrow the world's sin. That manifestation of God in Christ against sin culminated, as chap. ii. 2 has shown us, in the *ἱλασμὸς περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν* of our Lord's sacrificial death; but all else that Jesus was and did pointed the same way and wrought toward this end, which He¹ pursued with a single mind. Here is another echo, following that heard in chap. ii. 2, of the Baptist's saying, which in the first instance led the Apostle to Jesus and supplied him afterwards with the key to his Master's mission: "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world" (*ὁ αἶρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου*).

The qualifying "our" of the Received Text, before "sins," is due to the copyists: the Apostle is speaking broadly of that which is true not "for our sins only," but "for the world" (ii. 2). Writing *τὰς ἁμαρτίας* rather than *τὴν ἁμαρτίαν* (as in John i. 29), he conceives the abolition of sin, not as matter of principle and ideal, but as it is to be realized in concrete detail, and realized without limit: similarly it was said in chap. i. 9 that God "is faithful and righteous, that He should forgive us our *sins* and cleanse us from all unrighteousness." We speak too often, vaguely, of "sin," as a general principle and power, too little of definite and actual "sins." An abstract confession of the former may cover an obstinate adherence to the latter.

GEORGE G. FINDLAY.

(To be continued.)

THE VIEW FROM MOUNT NEBŌ.

THE view from Mount Nebo has been often and, in many respects, adequately described, yet when I came to look upon it, I found myself entirely unprepared for the feature which most arrested my attention. It is my present purpose to describe this feature, to indicate what it involves, and to consider some of the consequences that follow when it is duly appreciated.

To the full and accurate descriptions of what is to be seen from Mount Nebo, given by Col. Conder,¹ it would be difficult to add; but the very fullness of the description is only too likely to conceal, or at least to throw into undue subordination, the *limitation* of the view. Taking for granted, then, that the various points enumerated by Col. Conder are visible from Mount Nebo, I shall attempt in the first instance to indicate the nature and extent of this limitation, and, in so doing, to distinguish (while stating both) between impressions which naturally differ with different observers, and objective facts which remain the same for all, and, as such, can be appreciated no less away from the spot than on it.

It is unnecessary to discuss the question whether Jebel Nebā, which rises nearly 4,000 feet above the Dead Sea, and lies some ten miles due east of its north-eastern extremity, is the particular Moabite summit named Mount Nebo in the Old Testament. The identification has been commonly accepted since Dr. Tristram, in 1864, discovered that the name of Nebā attached to this point, and convincingly

¹ *Heth and Moab*, 134-9 (cited in *Survey of Eastern Palestine*, i. pp. 199 ff.): *Palestine*, 158-61.

criticized the identification with *Jebel Atṭārūs*, a somewhat loftier summit, ten miles further south, and by so much more distant from the steppes of Moab, which had previously been chief claimant to be the site of Mount Nebo. The feature in the view from *Jebel Nebā*, which I am about to discuss, must be not less conspicuous in views from any other point along the western edge of the plateau of Moab, from which no point rises sufficiently higher than *Jebel Nebā* to affect the following argument. For the present, too, I will postpone the consideration of identifications which, disregarding the direct statement of Deuteronomy xxxii. 49 (cp. xxxiv. 5), place Mount Nebo outside Moab.

Doubtless the impression made on the observer by the view from *Jebel Nebā* differs according to the direction from which the summit is approached. The plateau rises slightly towards its western edge, so that there is no view westward till the edge is reached. Consequently on one riding off the plateau to one of its projecting headlands, the view bursts suddenly in its depth and extent. On the other hand, riding up from the Jordan valley by any of the steep routes that make for the top one grows familiar with the view, and conscious of the increasing depth below, before the top is reached. Not only so, but from some of the lower but more projecting headlands a view in many respects more impressive than that from the higher crest is to be obtained. This is certainly the case with *Rās Šiāghah*, which is 350 feet lower and is reached considerably sooner than *Nebā* itself. Dr. Tristram,¹ Col. Conder, and Dr. G. A. Smith,² all describe the view as it struck them approaching *Jebel Nebā* from the plateau. In common with Dr. Post, whose admirable description has lain too much concealed in an article³

¹ *Land of Israel* (ed. 2), 540-43; *Land of Moab*, 323 ff.

² *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, 562 ff.

³ *Narrative of a Scientific Expedition in the Trans-jordanic region in the spring of 1886 in Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement*, 1888, pp. 175-237.

primarily devoted to botanical observations, I reached Jebel Nebā directly from below, going up "from the steppes of Moab to Mount Nebo, to the top of the Pisgah that is fronting Jericho" (Deut. xxxiv. 1).

It is unnecessary for me to describe my route at any length. I spent the night of March 14 in the "steppes of Moab," a little south of Tell er-Rāmeḥ, which I shall describe in another article. I rose at dawn the next morning and remarked how finely the hills across Jordan and the Dead Sea, which bounded the view westward, stood out in the early light. Starting from the camp at 6.45 and climbing steeply most of the way, but dipping a little just before reaching 'Ain Jemmaleh, I passed this spring (which was dry) at 9.30. Ten minutes beyond was a tree of no great size, but conspicuous in this treeless land; on that account, perhaps, the spot is sacred to a weli. In another twenty minutes we reached the fine springs known as 'Ayūn Mūsa. These and the streams issuing from them, of which one falls over a short wall of rock and in front of a deep-mouthed cavern clustered about with maiden-hair fern, have been sufficiently described,¹ but the charm of them has certainly not been exaggerated. Blue-clad Bedawy women were filling water-skins, lading therewith diminutive donkeys, and then driving them off to an encampment higher up. I stayed here a couple of hours, chatted with a group of Arab children and heard a solitary cuckoo calling. The view is rather contracted, but what there is is finely framed by the sides of the steep and narrow valley. A stiff but rideable climb of forty minutes from here brought us to the ruin-strewn summit of Rās Ṣīāghah.

After this some time was lost in climbing a very steep hill behind Rās Ṣīāghah, which Aḥmed, my guide, called Nebā. It commanded practically no view. The higher,

summit still further back he said was Rujum (i.e. Cairn) Nebā. Making for this, I had no difficulty, when I reached it, in recognizing that I was on the summit so well described by Conder; but I was keenly disappointed that the view had not more to add to what I had seen below, and, in particular, with the abrupt and continuous termination of it westwards. All this I doubtless might have realized beforehand; as a matter of fact I had not. But of this more hereafter. Leaving the summit I crossed the dip between it and the plateau, which proved a little deeper and rougher than I had anticipated, and reached Mēdebā in $1\frac{1}{4}$ hours. The following day I rode out to El-Maslūbiyeh, the promontory immediately south of Nebā, reaching the summit in $1\frac{1}{2}$ hours. The view hence is in its main features similar to that from Nebā, but it commands much more of the Dead Sea, most of which is shut out by this very range when one is standing on Nebā. There are ruins here also, and among one group of them I noticed a line stretched between props from which were suspended several tresses of hair. The next day on my way north I visited Ḥesbān; Ḥesbān stands much further back than either Nebā or El-Maslūbiyeh, but from the summit of the steep and scarcely ridable north hill, there is a view clear down to the Jordan valley through a considerable dip in the hills immediately to the east.

I had too recently approached Nebā, the most commanding point of view, from below to appreciate to the full the effect of riding off the far-stretching and almost level plateau, and looking down into and across the deep and steeply walled valley of Jordan from such points of view as El-Maslūbiyeh and Ḥesbān; yet even as it was the effect was impressive.

In proceeding now to compare the view from these Moabite heights, and in particular from Jebel Nebā, with the accounts of Moses' view of the Promised Land, it will

be convenient to bring together the various passages in the Old Testament that refer to the matter.

Three passages relate how Yahweh commanded Moses to ascend a mountain and view from thence the land he might not enter. In one of these (derived from the earlier source D) the sole object given for the ascent is the view, and nothing is expressly said as to Moses' death; but in one of the other two passages, both of which are derived from the later source P, it is clearly stated that Moses is to die in the same mountain from which the view is to be seen.

Deuteronomy iii. 23-29 (probably from D^s and written somewhat later than B.C. 621), reads thus:—

And I besought Yahweh at that time, saying, Let me go over, I pray Thee, and see the good land that is beyond Jordan, that goodly hill country and Lebanon. But Yahweh was enraged with me for your sakes, and hearkened not unto me; and Yahweh said unto me, Let it suffice thee: speak no more unto me of this matter. Go up to the top of the Pisgah and lift up thine eyes westward, and northward, and southward, and eastward, and see with thine eyes, for thou shalt not cross over this Jordan. But command Joshua, and encourage him, and strengthen him: for he shall go over before this people, and he shall cause them to inherit the land which thou shalt see. And we abode in the valley in the front of Beth-peor.

In P the command is first communicated briefly in Numbers xxvii. 12 f. :—

And Yahweh said unto Moses, Go up into this mountain of the 'Abarim, and see the land which I have given unto the children of Israel: and when thou hast seen it, thou also shalt be gathered to thy kinsmen as Aaron thy brother was gathered.

And then more fully in Deuteronomy xxxii. 48 ff. :—

And Yahweh spake unto Moses on this self-same day, saying, Go up unto this mountain of the 'Abārīm, unto Mount Nebo, which is in the land of Moab, which is fronting Jericho, and see the land of Canaan which I am giving to the children of Israel for a possession, and die in the mountain whither thou goest up, and be gathered to thy kinsmen, as Aaron thy brother died in Hor, the mountain, and was gathered to his kinsmen. For thou shalt see the land from a distance, but thither thou shalt not come into the land which I am giving to the children of Israel.

The narrative (Deut. xxxiv. 1-6) relating the actual circumstances of the view is derived in the main from the earliest source J E. Omitting what is derived from P¹ this runs as follows:—

[And Moses went up] to the top of the Pisgah. And Yahweh caused him to see all the land; *(even) Gilcal as far as Dan, and all Naphtali and all² the land of Ephraim and Manasseh, and all the land of Judah as far as the hinder sea, and the Negeb, and the Round, (even) the plain of Jericho, the city of palm trees as far as Zo'ar.*³ And Yahweh said unto him, This is the land which I swear unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, saying, I will give it unto thy seed: I have caused thee to see it with thine eyes, but thou shalt not go over thither. So Moses the servant of Yahweh died there in the land of Moab. And he buried him in the ravine in the land of Moab over against Beth-peor: but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day.

Now the general impression commonly produced by these various passages, and especially by the last, is that the view from Mount Nebo was very extensive. So far, good; the view from Jebel Nebā and from many other points along the edge of the plateau is in certain directions very extensive. But if this general impression were analysed, it would be found, I believe, to include in the case of most readers the following particulars:—

1. That the view from Mount Nebo embraces substantially more of the land west of Jordan (which Moses but for his sin would have traversed and distributed to the tribes)

¹ The analysis as between J E and P in Deut. xxxiv. 1-6 presents little difficulty. Those who attempt to distinguish between J and E refer the view to the older source J (Bacon, Carpenter and Harford). The opening words in square brackets above are supplied from Deut. iii. 27, which is probably dependent on J E. In the present composite narrative these words have been replaced by a sentence from P which mentions Mount Nebo. See Driver, *Deut.* 420 ff., on whose commentary the above translation also is based.

² The LXX. and the Syriac, no doubt rightly, read thus. In M T (and hence in R.V.), "all" has dropped out, probably by accident.

³ The words in italics may be a subsequent addition to J E; see below.

than can be seen from the "steppes of Moab" where Israel was at the time encamped.

2. That from the summit of Mount Nebo it is possible to look *over* Canaan; in other words, that in ascending from the plains Moses gradually rose high enough to get a clear view over the hills that blocked his view lower down till he finally saw Canaan spread out before him.

3. That, in detail, the view, in addition to embracing Gilead, the Jordan valley and the entire extent of contiguous districts on the west of Jordan from Galilee in the north to the Negeb in the south, extended to and included the two extreme points of Dan in the north and Zo'ar in the south, and in the west the Mediterranean sea.

Now if Mount Nebo was any Moabite summit, 3 (as to some extent has long been recognized) and 2 are false, and 1 true only to a much smaller extent than is, I believe, generally thought to be the case.

Older observers¹ were not certain that the Mediterranean was not visible from Jebel Nebā; but the survey of the country has set this doubt at rest. To see the Mediterranean from Moab is a physical impossibility.² But this fact, when duly understood, carries with it much more that has not yet gained general recognition.

Again, it is admitted that Dan, if identical with Tell el-Ḳaḏī and Zo'ar, if correctly placed at the south end of the Dead Sea, are not in sight from Jebel Nebā. The difficulty of Zo'ar might be overcome by supposing that the Zo'ar here referred to as terminating the view of the plain of Jordan southwards lay to the north of the Dead Sea. It would be more difficult to abandon the usual identification of Dan and to place it in the Merj 'Ayūn, where, though it would still be invisible from Jebel Nebā, it might possibly be visible from some other Moabite height.³ But

¹ Cp. Tristram, *Land of Moab*, 325.

² Conder, *Palestine*, 158.

³ W. F. Birch in *Pal. Expl. Fund. Quarterly Statements*, 1898, pp. 115 ff.

though Dan itself, 100 miles or so to the north, is out of sight, the mention of it does not produce a general impression of the view that is seriously amiss; the view northwards, or rather a little west of north, is certainly very extensive. Tabor, nearly seventy miles distant in a direct line, is in sight, and perhaps on perfectly clear days points further north and very little west of Dan may be visible.

In spite of Deuteronomy iii. 27, it is neither the view southward, which from Jebel Nebā is cut short by the neighbouring ridge of El-Maslūbiyeh, nor the view eastward, which extends but a couple of miles, nor the view northwards, which is considerably more extensive, that Moses is really represented as climbing Mount Nebo to see; it is the view *westward*—of the land which he might not enter, beyond the river which he might not cross. The main question therefore is: what is the character of the view westward from Jebel Nebā? How does it agree with the description in Deuteronomy xxxiv. 1-6? How far does it differ in character from the view to be obtained in the steppes of Moab below?

Now here the most immediately noticeable fact is that whereas Deuteronomy xxxiv. 3 includes the Mediterranean in the view, the Mediterranean, as already stated, cannot be seen from any Moabite summit. Two attempts have been made to get over this difficulty. Conder proposes to render, "Yahweh shewed him all Naphtali, and the land of Ephraim and Manasseh, and all the land of Judah, *towards* the hinder sea." This would be a weak and improbable rendering even if it were legitimate, for it makes the last clause pure verbiage, since you must look *towards* the Mediterranean, if you look at the districts mentioned at all. But as a matter of fact the rendering is illegitimate; the preposition 𐤆 means distinctly *as far as*. Birch proposes to interpret the "hinder sea" in this one passage not of the Mediterranean, as in Deuteronomy xi. 24, Joel ii. 30, Zechariah xiv. 8, but

of the Dead Sea. He has not, I believe, succeeded in persuading anyone to accept this hazardous interpretation, though Dr. Cheyne (*Encyc. Bibl.* 3367) so far agrees as to think that the original description did not mention the Mediterranean.

These desperate suggestions are mainly of interest as indicating the difficulties that the passage is felt to present. And yet they leave out of account a less obvious, but in many respects a greater, difficulty, which consists in the entire difference in general character of the view as described in Deuteronomy, and the view actually to be seen from Jebel Nebā. The description in Deuteronomy of the view westward is in terms of *districts*; modern descriptions (true to the facts) mainly in terms of *points*. Deuteronomy mentions as in view on the west of Jordan, in addition to the river valley itself, all Naphtali, all the land of Ephraim and Manasseh, all the land of Judah and the Negeb. These are districts. Modern descriptions mention a multiplicity of points or ridges such as Tabor, Rās Ibzīk, Ebal, Gerīzim, Neby Samwīl. The reader is only too likely to gain a wrong impression; half consciously he will *add* the points of the modern descriptions to the districts mentioned in the Bible *instead of substituting* the points for the districts, as he should do if his impression is to be correct. In any case the number of points that figure in these modern descriptions may easily give an exaggerated impression of the extensiveness of the view westward because, as a rule, the descriptions fail to indicate the very important and dominating fact that all view in this direction is abruptly cut short at a distance varying from thirty to forty miles, and that nearly half even of this distance is east of Jordan. Northwards (N.N.W.) from Nebo the view extends seventy miles at least (to a point ten miles west of Jordan), westwards (from S.W. to N.W.) forty at most.

If the description in Deuteronomy ran simply, “ And Yah-

weh shewed him all the land, and said unto him," the difficulty would be less; it would be easier to treat the single expression "all the land" as vague and general; but when the writer proceeds to explain what he includes in this expression by naming several districts and expressly referring to the totality of three of them (Naphtali, Ephraim and Manasseh, Judah), we can scarcely be expected to infer that from two-thirds to three-quarters of the districts on the west of Jordan, said to be wholly visible, is as a matter of fact invisible.¹ On the contrary if Deuteronomy xxxiv. 1-3 is a description of the view from Jebel Nebā by one who had seen it, and who knew what such expressions as "all the land of Judah" implied, he shows a remarkable lack of precision either in observation or description.

The main fact of the view westward from Jebel Nebā is this: it is a view from the top of one steep mountain wall across a valley nearly 4,000 feet deep to another steep mountain wall of almost exactly the same height.² But for this continuous wall opposite, the eye might readily travel to the Mediterranean, which is but seventy miles away; as it is, the wall, whose top is never more than forty miles distant, and seldom so much, necessarily cuts off the view not only of the sea, but also, as just stated, of about three-fourths of

¹ The reason being that the watershed which obstructs the view is much nearer the Jordan than the Mediterranean. Cp. G. A. Smith, *Hist. Geog.* 47 f. with the physical sketch map facing p. 50. Socin in the art. *Palestine* in *Encyc. Bibl.* says, "About three-fourths of the cis-Jordan country lies to the west of the watershed."

² The height of Jebel Nebā is 2,643 feet above sea level (the Dead Sea being 1,292 below the same); the average height of the Mount of Olives, which is barely 30 miles due east, is 2,600 feet. The highest point of Jerusalem just west of the Mount of Olives is 2,589 feet. At Hebron, 40 miles S.W. of Nebā, the western tableland is over 3,000 feet, it gradually drops northwards, but no ground under 2,000 feet occurs till, nearly 50 miles due north of Hebron, the neighbourhood of Nablus (40 miles N.W. of Nebā) is reached. Nablus, which lies at the top of the pass between Ebal and Gerizim, is 1,870 feet. Conder puts it thus: "The height of Mount Nebo is 2643·8 feet above the Mediterranean. The western watershed is from 3,000-2,500 feet above the same level."

the Land of Promise. Just as the view eastward from the Mount of Olives is stopped short by the straight line of what in the distance appear to be the perpendicular cliffs of Moab, so the view westward from Nebā is cut short by the similar cliffs by which the western tableland sinks to the Jordan valley.

Certainly the western wall does not show in its entire length quite so sustained an elevation as the eastern; higher points here and there rise upon it or a little behind it, and in the case of Ebal and Gerizim (to the N.W.) which rise respectively 1,000 and 1,200 feet above the pass between them, the break in the level is conspicuous. But other points often mentioned in descriptions of the view from Moab are much less significant; for example, Neby Samwīl (2,935 feet).

Now how does this fact, that the view westward from Jebel Nebā is for fifty miles and more (from S.W. to N.W.) of a mountain wall too high to be seen over, and never broken so as to be seen through, agree with the impression given by Deuteronomy xxxiv. 1-3? To correct that impression, is it enough to say that the Mediterranean is not actually seen from Nebā? Even if the words "as far as the hinder sea" were entirely eliminated, might the reader be safely left to draw the natural conclusion from the remaining statement that from Mount Nebo Moses saw "all Naphtali, and all the land of Ephraim and Manesseh, and all the land of Judah"? Surely not. He must be told, for he would never guess it, that the same wall that hides the sea hides also *nearly three-fourths* of the Promised Land. Not only so; the quarter that is seen includes, and mainly consists of, all that is most sterile and unattractive in western Palestine: straight opposite and most fully in sight is the Jeshimōn of Judah, that waste, chaotic wilderness which so well justified its name; and the long wall for fifty miles or more shows no respectable opening that allows the eye to

pierce through to possible broad and fertile valleys. The wadys leading up from Jericho to the high country behind may be descried, though less clearly than from nearer points in the plain below; still they are but narrow openings up to the unseen land above and beyond—mere cracks in the wall at this distance which the eye may follow up but cannot see through. Even the gap between Ebal and Gerizim cannot be seen through, and it is only to one already familiar with the country that it can speak of Shechem lying in its fertile and beautiful valley below. In the view itself there is no suggestion of fertility even there. The great break in this western wall at the plain of Jezreel is too far north to play much part in the view, though it allows Tabor standing ten miles west of Jordan to be seen.

Again and again as I travelled about Palestine I was struck with the extent to which Dr. G. A. Smith's *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, by its vivid and truthful descriptions, had diminished the necessity for actually visiting the country. But in this matter of the view from the Moabite plateau, he appears to have fallen so much under the fascination of the biblical descriptions that, in the particular which I am chiefly discussing, he does nothing to correct the wrong impression that is likely to be given by them. Let me quote his words, italicizing those that seem to me likely, particularly when taken together, to foster a wrong impression, for apart from these the description is correct and characteristically vivid:—

During their journey over the Table-land [of Moab], Israel had no view westward across the Dead Sea. For westward the plateau rises a little and shuts out all view, but on the other side of the rise it breaks up into promontories . . . which . . . afford a view of *all* Western Palestine (p. 562).

Then, speaking of the Nebā ridge in particular, Dr. Smith continues:—

You have lost the eastern view, but *all* Western Palestine is in sight; only the hither side of the Jordan valley is still invisible, and *north*¹ and south the view is hampered by the near hills. Follow the ridge to its second summit, the Rās Sīāghah, and you find yourself on a headland which, though lower than Rās Nebā, stands free of the rest of the range. The whole of the Jordan valley is now open to you, from Engedi, beyond which the mists become impenetrable, to where, on the north, the hills of Gilead seem to meet those of Ephraim. The Jordan flows below; Jericho is visible beyond. Over Gilead, it is said, Hermon can be seen in clear weather, but the heat hid it from us. The view is almost that described as the last on which the eyes of Moses rested, *the higher hills of Western Palestine shutting out all possibility of a sight of the sea* (p. 563).

Nebo . . where the host . . first lost their desert horizon and saw the Promised Land *open* before them (p. 565).

Col. Conder, in one of his descriptions referred to above, says :—

It is on the west² that the scene is most extensive, including all the Judean watershed,³ all Samaria and Lower Galilee, to Tabor and Belvoir. Carmel⁴ is hidden behind Jebel Hazkin, which is close to the Jordan valley and 700 feet higher than Carmel . . . The view thus described appears to be in accordance with the Old Testament account. . . . The only difficulty lies in the mention of Dan and of the western sea, which are not in sight from the ridge.

I have already stated how in actual presence of the scene I felt a much greater sense of the limitation of the view westward than the writers of the foregoing descriptions

¹ This should rather be north-east. Jebel 'Osha, which is almost due north, is in sight at 25 miles distance; i.e. the view north is almost as extensive as due west (about 30 miles). It is between N. and N.N.W. that the view extends furthest.

² The west as contrasted with the east or the south. Cp. the last footnote.

³ Good: if the author had added that this watershed cuts short the view westward at from 30 to 35 miles distance, he would have brought before us the dominating element in the view as successfully as he has actually made known to us the various points that are visible.

⁴ This may be taken in correction of Tristram, who, writing before the Survey, mentions Mount Carmel as in sight from Nebā and indeed from Rās Sīāghah (*Moab*, 325, 330). The fact that it is not, is important: for if Carmel were visible, the view at one point would extend clean across Western Palestine, whereas, as a matter of fact, it never does get half across.

appear to have felt; and I have also stated the main *facts* which must, impressions apart, be taken in modification or explanation of those descriptions. Let me add a part of Dr. Post's description, which I did not read until after my visit to Nebā; his alone of the descriptions known to me brings out the limitation of the view, though even he does not specify how great a proportion of "all the land" is actually invisible:—

When he [Moses] reached the bold headland of Šiāghah, he would linger to take in the wonderful foreground in which the whole host would now be visible filling the plain. The northern third of the Dead Sea, the Jordan valley, to the cleft at the bottom of which he knew lay the sea of Tiberias (albeit invisible from this point of view), and the whole profile of Palestine. Neither from this point, nor from the top of Nebo . . . could he literally see the Mediterranean. *The including of the great sea in the prospect must be taken in the same sense as the seeing of all the land. No mountain in Moab is high enough to enable one to see the Mediterranean over the hills of Palestine, nor to see anything but the eastern declivity of those hills and their profile against the western sky*¹ (p. 184).

From the summit of Nebā the view, as Dr. Post adds, would take in "a more comprehensive *profile*¹ of the promised land across Jordan."

It is interesting to note that a lady, probably S. Silvia of Aquitania, who visited Mount Nebo about the year 385 A.D., in describing the view, speaks more guardedly than some modern writers have done, claiming only to have seen "the most part of Palestine" (*maxima pars Palestinæ*). This is the more noticeable as she was accompanied to the summit, which there is little difficulty in recognizing as Rās Šiāghah, by those who knew the place, "priests and holy monks," and who undertook to point out the places written of in the books of Moses which were visible from the spot. I must content myself with a brief quotation,

¹ The italics are mine. For the appearance of the profile, see the sketch on p. 187 of Dr. Post's article.

which includes, however, all that she says of Western Palestine:—

From the door of the church we saw the place where the Jordan enters the Dead Sea, which place appeared below us as we stood. We saw also opposite not only Livias [i.e. Tell er-Rameh, whence she had ascended viâ 'Ayûn Mûsa], which was on the near side of Jordan, but Jericho which was beyond Jordan. . . The most part of Palestine, the land of promise, was seen from thence, also the whole Jordan territory—that is, as far as our eyes could reach.

Then follows a more detailed reference to several places mentioned by name—all east of the Jordan.¹

Dr. Driver has perceived that the limitations of the view are greater than the biblical description or the modern descriptions (primarily Conder's) on which he bases his own, expressly admit, and he has very rightly stated in his Commentary on Deuteronomy (p. 420) that if applied to the view from Jebel Nebâ, "the terms of Deut. xxxiv. 1-3 are hyperbolic, and must be taken as including points filled in by the imagination, as well as those actually visible to the eye." But the case is even stronger than this. The imagination has a great deal more to do than to supply invisible *points*; scarcely more than a fourth of the districts specified on the west of Jordan is visible to the eye; the remaining three-fourths must be filled in by the imagination. As soon as this is sufficiently realized, as soon as it is understood that it is no mere question of the Mediterranean, perhaps also of Dan and Zo'ar being just out of sight, it must be obvious that there is a difficulty, and it is natural to seek a way out.

Dr. Post, who feels the limitation of the view from Jebel Nebâ, is more than half inclined to identify Nebo with the far loftier Jebel 'Osha in Gilead, which is about twenty-five miles north of Nebâ. Jebel 'Osha (3,592 feet above sea level) is not only nearly 1,000 feet higher than Nebâ, but it

¹ *S. Silvia of Aquitania*, ed. J. H. Bernard in *Palestine Pilgrims' Text Society* (vol. i).

lies opposite a lower stage of the western ridge. The view, or strictly the combination of views, from the three peaks of which this mountain consists, must therefore be considerably less restricted than is that from Nebā, including Šiāghah, and must approach more nearly to what the biblical descriptions of the view from Mount Nebo lead us to expect. The view is thus described by Dr. Post¹ :—

From the southernmost of the western peaks . . . is seen the finest panorama of the opposite table-land of Palestine obtainable, far finer than that from any part of Jebel Nebā, including Siaghah. It takes in the heights above Hebron, the hill country of Judea, Benjamin, Ephraim, Galilee, and Hermon. From the north-eastern peak . . . may be seen the whole circle of the Promised Land, including the trans-Jordanic region. I noted the Hauran range, Jebel 'Ajlūn, Hermon, the mountains of Galilee, Samaria (the cleft of Nablus is exactly opposite), Carmel, the hill country of Judea, Moab to Jebel Shihān, and the rolling country which forms the watershed between, Moab and Gilead on the west, and the Syrian desert on the east. From this peak the Ghor and the eastern declivity of the Palestine table-land is hidden by the two western peaks. Were I seeking for a "Nebo," or "the top of a hill" over against Jericho, from the summit of which the most comprehensive as well as the most detailed view of the whole Promised Land might be obtained, I would choose Jebel Husha'. I am doubtful whether the name Nebā may not be an accommodation of the Arabs to the wishes of travellers.² Certainly nothing but the name entitles it to the preference over Jebel Husha' as the site of Moses' last view.

Three points in particular may be singled out in virtue of which the general impression produced by the view from Jebel 'Osha must come strikingly nearer that which the description of Deuteronomy xxxiv. 1-3 leads us to expect than does the view from Nebā. (1) Directly opposite, 1,800 feet below

¹ Cp. earlier, Seetzen, *Reisen*, ii. 318 f.; Merrill, *East of the Jordan*, 279.

² Such accommodation as Dr. Post suspects in the present instance is well known. But see Robinson, *Bibl. Researches*, ii. 307; Merrill, *East of the Jordan*, 245. It must also be remembered that Jerome's statements as to the site of Mount Nebo, and the town of the same name, point to Jebel Nebā, and apparently imply that the mountain and town were in his days still known by this name. *Onom.* (ed. Lagarde), 141, 30 ff., 142. 13 f., cp. 89. 8 ff. The same inference may be drawn from the description of S. Silvia of Aquitania, partly cited above.

and at twenty-five miles distance, is the pass of Shechem. This must give the impression of looking, at least, *into* the western land—an important point, as I can testify from my own experience. Unfortunately I did not myself visit Jebel 'Osha, but in travelling from Jerash to Beisan I rode for some distance along the edge of the plateau north of Jebel 'Osha. Here I looked over the plain of Beisan, the ancient plain of Jezreel, stretching away westwards into the country. The western view was no longer as in Moab, a wall without an opening, and I no longer felt, as I had felt there, walled out from, but rather invited across into, the western land. (2) The view includes Carmel, and therefore at one point at least extends right across the promised land. (3) The view must give some impression even of looking *over* this country; for, so the description implies, much is to be seen even on the peak, whence the eastern declivity, which alone is visible from Nebo, is hid.

As to the three specific farthest points of the view—Dan, Zo'ar, and the Mediterranean—'Osha seems as little to satisfy the description of Deuteronomy xxxiv. 1-3 as Nebo: Dr. Post at least mentions none of them as being visible. For my own part I am inclined to lay much less weight on these particular points than on the general character of the view. But there is one serious objection to identifying Mount Nebo with Jebel 'Osha which Dr. Post has overlooked. Mount Nebo, or the mountain on which Moses died, not only in the later priestly narrative, but in JE, which embodies the earliest tradition, is expressly said to be in Moab: Jebel 'Osha is not in Moab. There is at least no evidence that Moabite territory on the plateau, even in the days of its further extension northwards, ever stretched any distance north of the Wady Hesban, which flows some five miles north of Nebā and twenty south of Jebel 'Osha; and the most northerly point on the "steppes of Moab" below is still some ten or fifteen miles south of Jebel 'Osha.

So far then we have before us as alternatives to identify Nebo with Jebel Nebā, and to admit that the view is very inaccurately described; or with Jebel 'Osha, which is not in Moab, but commands a view, not indeed satisfying all the conditions, but giving a general impression less unlike that which the terms of Deuteronomy xxxiv. 1-3 suggest. Perhaps neither of these alternatives is impossible, for unless we hold that Moses wrote the account of his own death, we are not bound to assume that the view is described by one who had actually seen it.

But a more probable way out of the main part of the difficulty lies along the line of textual and literary criticism. Is the description of "all the land" in terms of specific places and districts in Deuteronomy xxxiv. 2f. from the same hand as the statement that Yahweh showed Moses "all the land"? or did the original story content itself with this indefinite statement (cp. Deut. iii. 23-29, Num. xxvii. 12, Deut. xxxii. 49)? and is the detailed description the note of a later editor or scribe¹ who wished to comment on the phrase "all the land" rather than to indicate the details of the view? Textual criticism shows us at least that this might be the point of interest to a scribe; for the Samaritan text, which *omits* the words that have occasioned all the trouble and sent people to Nebo in search of a view of the Mediterranean and much else that cannot be seen thence, contains instead a shorter statement that is evidently intended to describe, not a view, but what "all the land" ideally included. The Samaritan text runs: "And Yahweh caused him to see all the land *from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates, and unto the hinder sea.*" The words which I have italicized refer to the ideal boundaries of Israel's country, and they are obviously a gloss or editorial note based on Deuteronomy xi. 24.

¹ So Di. on the ground of peculiarities of expression; and Bacon (*Triple Tradition*) on the ground of its omission from the Samaritan text.

If we accept the interpretation (defensible only if the words in question be a gloss), that the geographical details define the extent of the land and not of the view, we are quit of the main difficulty. What remains may appear inconsiderable; yet perhaps it is real, and, if so, it is significant; in any case, to consider it may recall one or two facts apt to be forgotten. I will put the case in the form of a question: Is the difference in the character of the views from the steppes of Moab and from Jebel Nebā sufficiently great to account for Moses being taken up to the mountain top *in order to see the view of Western Palestine?* or, to put it otherwise, is the character of the country such as to give rise to a tradition that Moses ascended from the plains of Moab to Nebo in order to see the land he might not enter? The salient fact is this: in the steppes of Moab you look across Jordan to the mountain wall beyond; in ascending Nebā you rise between 3,000 and 4,000 feet and you retreat some miles from this wall; from the summit you see further along this wall, you see a peak or two behind it; but you just as little see over it as you did below. Your westward view remains just as abruptly cut short, a little further off it is true, but only by so much as you have retreated eastward. Canaan is for the most part invisible, alike in the plains below and from the summit above. You do not look *over* it, you do not even look *into* it, you merely look *at* it—at the eastern declivity of the high and broken tableland of which Canaan consists.

Again, the view from Nebā comprises in large part country that, as the story goes, had already been traversed by Moses, and, for the rest, country that his eye must often have rested on as he traversed the land of the Amorites northward to the Jabbok. In considering Moses' last view the fact is probably often overlooked (for the passages do not suggest it) that he had previously seen all, and more than all, that he could see from Mount Nebo, that, as Dr.

Post well puts it, "in going up Nebo from the valley of the Jordan, Moses was to take a *last*, not a *first*, look, and that over scenes now become familiar to him and his people." Yet such is the case if Jebel Nebā is Nebo, and Moses had previously traversed the country between Arnon and Jabbok (Num. xxi. 21-31).

Now do the narratives naturally convey the impression that Moses was to see from Nebo no further into the land which he might not enter than he could see below, and that he was to look on nothing at all that he and all his followers had not often seen before? I cannot think so: The difficulty might be overcome if we could take the phrase "Yahweh *caused him to see* all the land" to be used, much as in Amos vii. 1, 4, 7, viii. 1, of what was seen in vision.¹ In that case it would be as little meant that Moses, though he ascended a lofty mountain, actually saw from thence all Canaan as it can be meant that Jesus from the "exceeding high mountain" saw "all the kingdoms of the world" in a moment of time (Matt. iv. 8, Luke iv. 5). No mountain in existence commands a view of all the kingdoms of the world; no mountain in Moab of all Canaan. But this interpretation breaks down in the presence of *v.* 4: "I have caused thee to see it *with thine eyes*"; the writer who uses these words has in mind a view that was actually seen with ordinary human sight.

If, then, we should seem driven to locate the origin of the story away from Moab, we should most naturally look for its birthplace, as perhaps Steuernagel¹ tentatively, and certainly Cheyne,² have done, in the neighbourhood of

¹ This is assumed as self-evident by M. Clermont-Ganneau, who writes (*P. E. F.* 1901, p. 245): "It must not be forgotten that the vision of Moses is a veritable vision in the ideal sense of the word—a supernatural vision, not subject to the conditions of time and space. It is certain that it is humanly impossible to the ordinary eyes to perceive from the height of Nebo all the extent of country that Moses is reputed to have viewed."

² *Die Einwanderung der israelitischen Stämmen*, p. 72.

² Articles "Nebo," "Moses" (§ 16) in *Encyc. Biblica*.

Kadesh. Did the mountain north of Kadesh, mentioned in a confused story (Num. xiv. 43), command a view of that limited land of promise which the spies had traversed, and which extended only so far as Hebron? and was it this view that called forth the cry, "We will go up unto the place which Yahweh hath promised"? and was it from this same summit, or a more commanding height in the same region, that Moses, according to the earliest form of the tradition, saw the land which he was not to enter?

With questions such as these we enter on a field of pure speculation which cannot be further investigated at the close of this article. Nor do I wish to close in speculation. Let me rather summarize the facts which I have shown must receive attention and some explanation in connexion with the narratives of Moses' last view:—

1. Not only the Mediterranean but nearly three-quarters of the country west of Jordan are invisible from Jebel Nebā, or from any point along the edge of the Moabite plateau.

2. The view from any such point includes only what must have become perfectly familiar to Moses and the people, as they traversed the land between Arnon and Jabboḳ.

3. The view westwards, though more extensive, is substantially of the same character as the view from the steppes of Moab; both are abruptly terminated by the same mountain wall.

G. BUCHANAN GRAY.

*THE LETTER TO THE CHURCH IN
PHILADELPHIA.*

THE address of the Philadelphian letter is conceived with evident reference to the topics mentioned in the body of the letter, and to the character and past history of the Church. The writer is "he that hath the key of David, that openeth and none shall shut"; and the history of Philadelphia and its Church has been determined in the past, and will in the future be determined, mainly by the fact that "I have set before thee a door opened, which none can shut."

The writer of the letter is "he that is true"; and the Philadelphian Church "kept my word and did not deny my name," but confessed the truth, whereas its enemies are they "which say they are Jews, and they are not, but do lie." The writer of the letter is "he that is holy"; and the picture of Philadelphia that is given in the letter marks it beyond all others of the Seven as the holy city, which "I have loved," which kept my word and my injunction of endurance (a commendation twice repeated).

It may fairly be considered a complimentary form of address when the writer invests himself with the same character that he praises in the Church addressed. That is also the case in the Smyrnaean letter: there he "which was dead and lived" addresses the Church which, as he anticipates, will suffer to death and thereby gain the crown of life. But it is hardly the case in any other letter. In addressing Ephesus and Pergamum and Thyatira the writer speaks as holding that position and authority and power, which they are by their conduct losing. The writer to Sardis occupies the honourable position which Sardis has lost beyond hope of recovery. The writer to Laodiceia is faithful and true, addressing a Church which is reproached for its want of genuineness.

In this respect, then, the letters to Smyrna and Philadelphia form a class by themselves; and the analogy extends to other characteristics. These two Churches are praised with far more cordiality and less reserve than any of the others. They have both had to contend with serious difficulties. The Smyrnaean Church was poor and oppressed, the Philadelphian Church had but little power. Before both there is opened a prospect of suffering and trial; but in both cases a triumphant issue is confidently anticipated. Life for Smyrna, honour and dignity for Philadelphia, are promised—not for a residue amid the unfaithful, as at Thyatira or Sardis, but for the Church in both cities. It is an interesting coincidence that those are the two cities which have been the bulwark and the glory of Christian power in the country since it became Mohammedan; the two places where the Christian flag floated latest over a free and powerful city, and where even in slavery the Christians preserved cohesion among themselves and real influence among the Turkish conquerors.

Another analogy is that in those two letters alone is the Jewish Nationalist party mentioned. Now the Nationalist party existed wherever there was a body of Jews settled, either as resident strangers or as citizens of the town; and there can hardly be any doubt that in every important commercial centre in the Province Asia there was a body of Jews settled. In every one of the Seven Cities, we may be sure, there was a Nationalist Jewish party, opposing, hating and annoying the Jewish Christians and with them the whole Church in the city. If that difficulty is mentioned only in those two cities, Smyrna and Philadelphia, the natural inference is that it had been more serious in them than in the others; and that can only be because the Jews were, for some reason or other, specially influential there. Doubtless the reason lay in their numbers and their wealth; and hence the weakness and poverty of the Chris-

tian party is specially mentioned in those two Churches.

The body of the letter begins with the usual statement that the writer is familiar with the history and activity of the Philadelphian Church: "I know thy works." Then follows, as usual, an outline of the past achievements and conduct of that Church; but this outline is couched in an unusual form. "See, I have given before thee a door opened, which no one is able to shut." There can be no doubt what the "opened door" means. It is a Pauline metaphor, which had passed into ordinary usage in the early Church. At Ephesus "a great door and effectual was opened" to him (1 Cor. xvi. 9). At Troas also "a door was opened" for him (2 Cor. ii. 12). He asked the Colossians to pray "that God may open unto us a door for the word, to speak the mystery of Christ" (Coloss. iv. 3). In these three Pauline expressions the meaning is clearly explained by the context: a "door opened" means a good opportunity for missionary work. In the *Revelation* this usage has become fixed, and the word "door" is almost a technical term, so that no explanation in the context is thought necessary; unless the Pauline use had become familiar and almost stereotyped, the expression in this letter would hardly have been possible.

The history of Philadelphian activity had been determined by its unique opportunity for missionary work; there had been given to it a door opened before it. The expression is strong: it is not merely "I have set before thee a door"; it is "I have given (thee the opportunity of) a door (which I have) opened before thee." This opportunity was a special gift and privilege and favour bestowed upon Philadelphia. Nothing of the kind is mentioned for any other city.

The situation of the city fully explains this saying. Philadelphia lay at the upper extremity of a long valley, which opens back from the sea. After passing Philadelphia

the road along this valley ascends to the Phrygian land and the great Central Plateau, the main mass of Asia Minor. This road was the one which led from the harbour of Smyrna to the north-eastern parts of Asia Minor and the East in general, the one rival to the great route connecting Ephesus with the East, and the greatest Asian trade-route of later times, when the harbour of Ephesus had been completely destroyed. The Imperial Post-Road from Rome to the East also passed through Philadelphia.

Philadelphia, therefore, was the keeper of the gateway to the plateau. It had been founded, doubtless, to guard the door and to keep it closed against the enemy; but the door had now been permanently opened before the Church, and the work of Philadelphia had been to go forth through the door and carry the gospel to the cities of the Phrygian land.

It is not stated explicitly that Philadelphia used the opportunity that had been given it; but that is clearly implied in the context. The door had been opened for the Philadelphian Church by Him who does nothing in vain: He did this, because the opportunity would be used.

Here alone in all the Seven Letters is there an allusion to the fact which seems to explain why those special Seven Cities were marked out for "the Seven Churches of Asia." But it would be wrong to infer that Philadelphia alone among the Seven Cities had a door before it. Each of the Seven stood at the door of a district. In truth every Church had its own opportunity; and all the Seven Churches had specially favourable opportunities opened to them by geographical situation and the convenience of communication. But it lies in the style and plan of the Seven Letters to mention only in one case what was a common characteristic of all the Seven Cities; and Philadelphia was selected, because in its history that fact—its relation to the cities on the near side of the Central Plateau—had been the determining factor. Philadelphia

must have been pre-eminent among the Seven Cities as the missionary Church. We have no other evidence of this; but the situation marks out this line of activity as natural, and the letter clearly declares that the Philadelphian Church acted accordingly.

The construction of the following words in the Greek is obscure, and it is possible to translate in several ways. But the rendering given in the Authorized Version (abandoned unfortunately in the Revised Version) must be preferred: "I know thy works; see, I have given thee the opportunity of the opened door, because thou hast little power, and didst keep My word and didst not deny My name." The opened door is here explained to have been a peculiar favour granted to Philadelphia on account of its weakness combined with its loyalty and truth.

If the Philadelphian Church was weak, so also was the city. It had suffered from earthquakes more than any other city of all Asia.

In A.D. 17 a great earthquake had caused very serious damage; and the effects lasted for years after. The trembling of the earth continued for a long time, so that the inhabitants were afraid to repair the injured houses, or did so with carefully studied devices to guard against collapse. Two or three years later, when Strabo wrote, shocks of earthquake were an everyday occurrence. The walls of the houses were constantly gaping in cracks; and now one part of the city, now another part, was suffering. Few people ventured to live in the city; and Strabo expresses his astonishment that any were so fond of the place as to live there, since their houses were so dangerous, and still more that any one had ever been so foolish as to found the city. Most of the population then spent their lives outside, and devoted themselves to cultivating the fertile Philadelphian territory; and there is an obvious reference to this in a later sentence of the letter, where the

promise is given to the faithful Philadelphians that they shall go out thence no more. Those who stayed in the city had to direct their attention to the motions of the earth, and guard against the danger of falling walls by devices of building and propping.

Such a calamity, and the terror it had inspired, naturally hindered the development and prosperity of Philadelphia. The Emperor Tiberius indeed treated Philadelphia and the other eleven Asian cities, which suffered about the same time, with great liberality; and aided them to regain their strength both by grants of money and by remission of taxation. Though at the moment of the great earthquake Sardis had suffered most severely, Philadelphia (as is clear from Strabo's account) was much slower in recovering from the effects, owing to the long-continuance of minor shocks and the terror and apprehension which was spread by the reputation of the city as a place of danger. The world in general thought, like Strabo, that Philadelphia was unsafe to enter, that only a rash person would live in it, and only fools could have ever founded it. No coins appear to have been struck in the city during the twenty years that followed the earthquake; and this is attributed by numismatists to the impoverishment and weakness caused by that disaster.

Gradually, as time passed, people recovered confidence. Subsequent history has shown that the situation about A.D. 17-20, as described by Strabo, was unusual. Philadelphia has not been more subject to earthquakes in subsequent time than other cities of Asia. So far as our scanty knowledge goes, Smyrna has suffered more. But when the Seven Letters were written the memory of that disastrous period was still fresh. People remembered, and perhaps still practised, the camping out in the open country; and they appreciated the comfort implied in the promise, verse 12, "he shall go out thence no more." They appreciated,

also, the guarantee that, as a reward for the Church's loyalty and obedience, "*I also will keep thee from the hour of trial, that hour which is to come upon the whole world, to try them that dwell upon the earth.*" The Philadelphians who had long lived in constant dread of "*the hour of trial*" would appreciate the special form in which this promise of help is expressed.

The concluding promise of the letter resumes this allusion. "*He that overcometh I will make him a pillar in the temple of my God, and he shall go out thence no more.*" The pillar is the symbol of stability, of the firm support on which the upper part of the temple rests. The victor shall be shaken by no disaster in the great day of trial; and he shall never again require to go out and take refuge in the open country. The city which had suffered so much and so long from instability was to be rewarded with the Divine firmness and steadfastness.

That is not the only gift that has been granted the Philadelphian Church. "See! I am giving of the Synagogue of Satan, who profess themselves to be Jews, and they are not, but do lie: see! I will make them come and do reverence before thy feet and know that I have loved thee." This statement takes us into the midst of the long conflict that had been going on in Philadelphia. The Jews and the Jewish Christians had been at bitter enmity; and it must be confessed that, to judge from the spirit shown in St. John's references to the opposite party, the provocation was not wholly on one side. The Jews boasted themselves to be the national and patriotic party, the true Jews, the chosen people, beloved and favoured of God, who were hereafter to be the victors and masters of the world when the Messiah should come in His kingdom. They upbraided and despised the Jewish Christians as traitors, unworthy of the name of Jews, the enemies of God. But the parts shall soon be reversed. The promise begins in the present

tense, "I am giving"; but it breaks off in an incomplete sentence, and commences afresh in the future tense, "I will make them (who scorned you) to bow in reverence before you, and to know that you (and not they) are the true Jews whom I have loved."

In Philadelphia, as in Smyrna, it is clear that the Jewish Christians must have been a comparatively numerous body, more so than in the other five Churches; and there was a correspondingly large number of Jews in the city.

Another indication that the great disaster was long remembered in Philadelphia may be perhaps found in the same verse 12. In gratitude for the liberal help which the city received from the Emperor Tiberius, the New Caesar (Neos Kaisar), it had sought permission to take a new name from the Imperial title, and the Emperor had crowned his kindness to the city by granting it leave to take the name Neokaisareia. It wrote on itself the name of the Imperial God, and called itself the city of its Imperial God present on earth.

Such a permission was esteemed a very great honour; and there can be no doubt that a shrine of the New Caesar, with a priest and a regular ritual, must have been established in Philadelphia at that time, soon after A.D. 17. This was a purely municipal foundation, quite different in character from the provincial temples established in Pergamum to Augustus, in Smyrna to Tiberius, and in Ephesus to Nero. The one was established by the city at its own cost, and for its own benefit and glorification. Those others were established by the Provincial Council, and the whole province shared in the expense and took part in the ritual, though the selected cities undoubtedly bore a large proportion of the expense of maintenance in acknowledgment of the honour of being selected as representative cities of the Province.

There is no evidence to prove the statements which we have

just made as to the origin of the name Neokaisareia. Coins furnish almost the only evidence in such cases; and (as has been stated) Philadelphia was too poor to strike coins during the reign of Tiberius. Only under Caligula, did coins begin once more to be struck at Philadelphia: some of these bear the name Neokaisareia. As the series begins only under Caligula, the great Swiss numismatist, M. Imhoof-Blumer, considers that the name Neokaisareia was assumed in his honour in 37 or 38 A.D. But no reason is known why the name should have been taken under Caligula, while there was an excellent reason for assuming it in the time of Tiberius. Sardis, in commemoration of the same event, assumed the epithet Kaisareia; other cities which had been relieved by Tiberius then took the names Hierokaisareia and Kaisareia.¹ The lack of proof that the name Neokaisareia is as old as Tiberius is inevitable, since no coins are known under that Emperor. It is a familiar and accepted principle that names and titles of cities are in many cases found on coins only a considerable time after they were bestowed: thus, for example, the name Claudio-Derbe is not found on coins of Derbe earlier than the time of the Antonines, but it was obviously bestowed on the city a full century earlier under Claudius: Smyrna becomes Neokoros of the Emperors under Tiberius, but the title is first found on coins under Trajan, sixty years later.

When a Philadelphian read in this letter the words, "he that overcometh . . . I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, the new Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my God, and mine own new name," he could not fail to see a reference to the history of the city. The form of expres-

¹ Kyme and Mostene, like Sardis, assumed the additional title Kaisareia: Hierakome changed its name to Hierokaisareia. Tiberius is styled in an inscription of Mostene *conditor uno tempore XII. civitatum*. He was therefore the founder of Philadelphia as one of the twelve; and the city which he founded was no longer called Philadelphia, but Neokaisareia.

sion usual throughout the Seven Letters is here exemplified. Whatever the enemy can do for the pagan city, the Author of the letter will do far better for his own. If Philadelphia was honoured with an epithet embodying the name of the Divine Flavian Family, He will write on His own "the name of my God." If Philadelphia once assumed the new name of "the city of the Imperial God, the New Caesar," He will write on His own "the name of the city of my God, and mine own new name."

It is often incorrectly said that the victor receives three names—of God, of the Church, and of Christ; but the real meaning is that a name is written on him which has all three characters, and is at once the name of God, the name of the Church, and the new name of Christ. What that name shall be is a mystery, like the secret name written on the white tessera for the Pergamenian victor.

None of the Seven Cities except Philadelphia had ever given up its own name, and substituted the name of the reigning Imperial God. The other great cities of Asia were too proud of their own ancient names to abandon them even for an Imperial title. Sardis, indeed, which also suffered from the earthquake of A.D. 17, had assumed the epithet *Caesareia* at that time, but that was only an epithet, which never replaced the old name; it soon fell into disuse, and is never found on coins later than Caligula A.D. 37-41. But Philadelphia in its hour of weakness may perhaps have felt that the Imperial title was a source of strength; and, as it began to recover, it recurred to its own name.

Under Vespasian the Imperial epithet *Flavia* was added to the name Philadelphia; and the double name was in ordinary use when the Seven Letters were written.

As in the Smyrnaean letter, so in the Philadelphian, there is no word of blame; there is nothing but approval of the past and promise for the future. The Philadelphian Church, weak and persecuted, had imitated Christ's ex-

ample, and His teaching, of patient endurance; and when the dread hour of universal trial comes to them, Christ will keep them from being overwhelmed by it.

The one word of advice and counsel is the same as in the Smyrnaean letter: "hold fast that which thou hast," continue to do as you are doing; and the crown (of life) which was promised to Smyrna, and which Philadelphia also has won, shall remain in your possession.

History has justified the promise. On those occasions when we can catch a glimpse of the state of things in the city, it was surrounded by increasing alarms, of old from earthquakes, at a later time from the attacks of the Turks; but through all it endured. It was long the solitary Christian city in a country which had passed entirely into Turkish hands (with the distant exception of the harbour of Smyrna, which was held by the Knights of St. John after the acropolis had become Turkish). Yet Philadelphia struggled on, a little weak city against a whole nation of soldiers. It alone upheld the Christian flag in a Moslem country. It did not deny the name. It was patient to the end. It stood siege after siege, reduced to starvation, but maintaining its independence. It was deserted by the Christian Empire of Constantinople, and at last by the Christian West; but still it fought on. Finally, at the end of the fourteenth century, it yielded to a coalition between a Turkish Sultan and a Byzantine Emperor. What the Turks could never do by their unaided strength, they achieved by turning to account the divisions and jealousies of the Christians. The Emperors had no sympathy for the city which maintained its independence after they had abandoned it. There has been written on the history of Philadelphia a name that is imperishable so long as heroic resistance against overwhelming odds and persevering self-reliance amid desertion by the world are held in honour and remembrance.

CHARACTERISTICS OF NEW TESTAMENT
GREEK.

IX.

It is time now that we should pass on to the wide field of the Verb, which unless we reduce our scale will keep us busy for some time to come. It will be well to begin with a brief sketch of a subject which has not yet achieved an entrance into the grammars. For the last few years the comparative philologists—mostly (as usual) in Germany—have been busily investigating the problems of *Aktionsart*, the “kind of action” denoted by different verbal formations. The subject, naturally complex, has unfortunately been darkened not a little by inconsistent terminology, but it must be studied by all who wish to understand the rationale of the use of the Tenses, and the extremely important part which Compound Verbs play in the Greek and other Indo-Germanic languages. I may refer the English student to pp. 477 ff. of Mr. P. Giles’s admirable *Manual of Comparative Philology*, ed. 2. He will find a fuller summary in pp. 471 ff. of Karl Brugmann’s *Griech. Gramm.*, ed. 3, where the great philologist sets forth the results of Delbrück and other pioneers in comparative syntax, with an authority and lucidity all his own.

The student of Hebrew will not need telling that a Tense-system, dividing verbal action into the familiar categories of Past, Present and Future, is by no means so necessary to language as we conceive it to be. It may be more of a surprise to be told that in our own family of languages Tense is proved by scientific inquiry to be relatively a late invention, so much so that the elementary distinction between Past and Present was only developed to a rudimentary extent when the various branches of the family separated beyond the stage of mutual intelligibility.

As the language then possessed no Passive whatever, and no distinct Future, it will be realised that its resources needed not a little supplementing. But if they were poor in one direction, they were superabundant in another. Brugmann distinguishes no less than twenty-three conjugations, or present-stem classes, of which traces remain in Greek; and there are others preserved in other languages. We must add the aorists and perfect as formations essentially parallel. In most of these we are able to detect an *Aktionsart* originally appropriate to the conjugation, though naturally blurred by later developments. It is seen that the Aorist has a *punktuell* action—I wish the English *punctual* were a possible equivalent!—that is, it regards action as a *point*: it represents the point of entrance (*Ingressive*, as βαλεῖν “let fly,” βασιλεύσαι “come to the throne”), or that of completion (*Effective*, as βαλεῖν “hit”), or it looks at a whole action simply as having occurred, without distinguishing any steps in its progress (*Constative*, as βασιλεύσαι “reign,” or as when a sculptor says of his statue, ἐποίησεν ὁ δεῖνα “X. made it”). On the same graph the Constative will be a line reduced to a point by perspective. The Present has generally a *durative* action—linear, we might call it to keep up the same graphic illustration—as βάλλειν “to be throwing,” βασιλεύειν “to be on the throne.” The *Perfect* action is a variety by itself, denoting what began in the past and still continues: thus from the “point” root *weido*, “discover, descry,” comes the primitive perfect οἶδα, “I discovered (εἶδον) and still enjoy the results,” i.e. “I know.” The present stems which show an *ι*-reduplication (ἴσθημι, γίγνομαι) are supposed to have started with an *Iterative* action, so that γίγνομαι would originally present the succession of moments which are individually represented by ἐγενόμην. And so throughout the conjugations which are exclusively present. Other conjugations are

capable of making both present and aorist stems, as ἔφην compared with ἔβην, γράφειν with τραπέειν, στένειν with γερέσθαι. In these the verb root itself is by nature either (a) "punktuell" (b) durative, or (c) capable of both. Thus the root of ἐνεγκεῖν, like our *bring*, is essentially a "point" word, being classed as "Effective": it accordingly can form no present stem. That of φέρω, *fero*, *bear*, on the other hand, is essentially durative or "linear": it can therefore form no aorist stem.¹ So with that of ἔστι, *est*, *is*, which has no aorist, while ἐγενόμην, as we have seen, had no durative present. An example of the third class is ἔχω, which (like our own *have*) is ambiguous in its action. "I had your money" may mean either "I received it" (point action) or "I was in possession of it" (linear action). In Greek the present stem is regularly durative, "to hold," while ἔσχον is a point word, "I received": it is, for instance, the normal expression in a papyrus receipt—ἔσχον παρὰ σοῦ. The misapprehension of the action of ἔχω is responsible for most of the pother about ἔχωμεν in Romans v. 1.² The durative present of course means "let us enjoy the possession of peace": δικαιωθέντες ἔσχομεν εἰρήνην is a premiss which is unexpressed, as St. Paul wishes to urge his readers to remember and make full use of a privilege which they *ex hypothesi* possess from their justification.

It is evident that this study of the kind of action denoted by verbal roots, and the modification of that action produced by the formation of tense and conjugation stems, will have considerable influence upon our lexical treatment of the many verbs in which present and aorist are derived

¹ The new aorist (historically perfect) in the Germanic languages (our *bore*) has a constative action.

² Latest in Mr. McClellan's article in the September EXPOSITOR, p. 190; but much less old-fashioned scholars have fallen into the same snare. See S.H. *in loc.* (I use the epithet without prejudice; but really one can only refer to a "stern, unbending Toryism" in scholarship, that robust faith in the Received Text, and other anachronisms, which prompts Mr. McClellan's onslaught on the Revised Version).

from different roots. 'Οράω (cognate with our "beware") is very clearly durative wherever it occurs in the New Testament; and we are at liberty to say that this root, which is incapable of forming an aorist, maintains its character in the perfect, "I have watched, continuously looked upon," while ὄπωπα would be "I have caught sight of." Εἶδον "I discovered" and ὄφθην "I came before the eyes of" are obviously point-words, and can form no present. Εἶπον has a similar disability, and we remember at once that its congeners ἔπος, vox, Sanskrit *vāc*, etc., describe a single utterance: much the same is true of ἐρρέθην, and the nouns ῥῆμα *verbum*, and *word*. On the other hand λέγω, whose constative aorist ἔλεξα is replaced in ordinary language by εἶπον, clearly denotes speech in progress, and the same feature is very marked in λόγος. The meaning has been developed in post-Homeric times along lines similar to those which in Latin produced *sermo* from the purely physical verb *sero*. One more example we may give, as it leads to our remaining point. 'Εσθίω is very obviously durative: ὁ ἐσθίων μετ' ἐμοῦ, Mark xiv. 18, is "he who is taking a meal with me." The root *ed* is so distinctly durative that it forms no aorist, but the "point-word" φαγεῖν (originally "to divide") supplies the vacancy. It will be found that φαγεῖν in the New Testament is invariably constative: ¹ it denotes simply the action of ἐσθίειν seen in perspective, and not either the beginning or the end of that action. But we find the compound κατεσθίειν, καταφαγεῖν, used to express the completed act, eating something till it is finished. How little the preposition's natural meaning affects the result, is seen by the fact that what in

¹ There is one apparent exception, Rev. x. 10, where ὅτε ἔφαγον αὐτό is "when I had eaten it up." But ἔφαγον is simply the continuation of κατέφαγον in v. 9. Cf. John i. 11 f. παρέλαβον . . . ἔλαβον, Rom. xv. 4 προεγράφη . . . ἐγράφη. The stock example of this Greek rule is Euripides, *Bacchae* 1065, κατήγον, ἦγον, ἦγον, which we translate "pulled down, down, down," repeating the preposition instead of the verb. I do not remember seeing this principle noted for the New Testament.

Greek is *κατεσθίειν* and in Latin “*devorare*” is in English “*eat up*” and in Latin also “*comesse.*” In all the Indo-Germanic languages, most conspicuously and systematically in the Slavonic, but clearly enough in our own, this function of verb compounds may be seen. The choice of the preposition which is to produce this *perfective* action¹ depends upon conditions which vary with the meaning of the verbal root. Most of them are capable of “*perfectivising*” an imperfective verb, if the original adverb’s local sense has been sufficiently obscured. We may compare in English the meaning of *bring* and *bring up*, *sit* and *sit down*, *drive* and *drive away* and *drive home*,² *knock* and *knock in* and *knock down*, *carry* and *carry off* and *carry through*, *work* and *work out* and *work off*, *fiddle* and *fiddle in* (Tennyson’s “*Amphion*”), *set* and *set back* and *set at* and *overset*, *see* and *see to*, *write* and *write off*, *hear* and *hear out*, *break* and *to-brake* (Judges ix. 53, A.V.), *make* and *make over*, *follow* and *follow up*, *come* and *come on*, *go* and *go round*, *shine* and *shine away* (= *dispel* by shining). Among all the varieties of this list it will be seen that the compounded adverb in each case *perfectivises* the simplex, the combination denoting action which has accomplished a result, while the simplex denoted action in progress, or else momentary action to which no special result was assigned. In this list are included many examples in which the local force of the adverb is very far from being exhausted. *Drive in*, *drive out*, *drive off*, *drive away*, and *drive home* are alike perfective, but the goals attained are different according to the distinct sense of the adverbs. In a great many compounds the local force of the adverb is so strong that it leaves the action

¹ One could wish that a term had been chosen which would not have suggested an echo of the tense-name. “*Perfective action*” has nothing whatever to do with the Perfect tense.

² “*Prepositions,*” when compounded, are of course still the pure adverbs they were at the first, so that this accusative noun turned adverb is entirely on all fours with the rest.

of the verb untouched. The separateness of adverb and verb in English, as in Homeric Greek, helps the adverb to retain its force longer than it does in Latin and later Greek. In both these languages many of the compound verbs have completely lost consciousness of the meaning originally borne by the prepositional element, which is accordingly confined to its perfectivising function. This is especially the case with *com* (*con*) and *ex* (*e*) in Latin, as *consequi* "follow out, attain," *efficere* "work out," and with *ἀπό*, *διά*, *κατά* and *σύν* in Greek, as *ἀποθανεῖν* "die" (*θνήσκειν* "be dying"), *διαφυγεῖν* "escape" (*φεύγειν* = "flee"), *καταδιώκειν* "hunt down" (*διώκω* = "pursue"), *κατεργάζεσθαι* "work out," *συντηρεῖν* "keep safe" (*τηρεῖν* = "watch"). But many compounds with these prepositions have none of the perfective force, as *διαπορεύεσθαι*, *καταβαίνω*, *ἀπ-* and *συν-έρχεσθαι*, where the preposition is still very much alive. And many other prepositions on occasion exhibit the perfectivising power. I should be inclined, for example, to describe thus the function of *ἐπί* when compounded with *γινώσκω*. The simplex in the present stem is durative, "to be taking in knowledge." The simplex aorist has point action, generally *effective*, meaning "ascertain, realise," but occasionally (as in John xvii. 25, 2 Tim. ii. 19) it is constative: *ἔγνων σε* gathers into one perspective all the successive moments of *γινώσκωσιν σε* in John xvii. 3. *Ἐπιγινῶναι*, "find out, determine," is rather more decisive than the former use of *γινῶναι*; but in the present stem it seems to differ from *γινώσκειν* in the inclusion of the goal in the picture of the journey there—it tells of knowledge already gained. Thus 1 Corinthians xiii. 12 may be paraphrased, "Now I am acquiring knowledge which is only partial at best: then I shall have learnt my lesson, shall know, as God in my mortal life knew me."

The meaning of the Present-stem of these perfectivised roots naturally demands explanation. Since *θνήσκειν* is

“to be dying” and ἀποθανεῖν “to die,” what is there left for ἀποθνήσκειν? An analysis of the occurrences of this particular stem in the New Testament will anticipate some important points we shall have to make under the Tenses as such. Putting aside the special use μέλλω ἀποθνήσκειν,¹ we find the present stem used as an *iterative* in 1 Corinthians xv. 31, and as *frequentative* in Hebrews vii. 8, x. 28, 1 Corinthians xv. 22, Revelation xiv. 13, describing action taking place from time to time with different individuals, as the iterative describes action repeated by the same agent.² In John xxi. 23 and 1 Corinthians xv. 32 it stands for a future, a question to which we must return. Only in Luke viii. 42, 2 Corinthians vi. 9 and Hebrews xi. 21 is it strictly durative, replacing the now obsolete simplex θνήσκω.³ The simplex, however, vanished only because the “linear perfective” expressed its meaning sufficiently, denoting as it does the whole process leading up to an attained goal. Καταφεύγειν, for example, implies that the refuge is reached, but it depicts the journey there in one view: καταφυγῆναι is only concerned with the moment of arrival. A very important example in the New Testament is the recurrent οἱ ἀπολλύμενοι “the perishing.” Just as much as ἀποκτείνω, and its passive ἀποθνήσκω, ἀπόλλυμαι⁴ implies the completion of the process of destruction. When we speak of a “dying” man we do not absolutely bar the possibility of a recovery, but our word implies death as the goal assured. Similarly in the cry of the Prodigal, ἀπόλλυμαι λιμῶ, and in that of the disciples in the storm,

¹ Μέλλω c. pres. inf. comes eighty-four times in New Testament; c. fut. twice in Acts (μ. ἔσεσθαι); c. aor. six times (Acts xii. 6, Rom. viii. 18, Gal. iii. 23, Rev. iii. 2 (ἀποθανεῖν), 16, xii. 4; (also Luke xx. 36 in D and Marcion).

² Both will be (. . .), a series of points, on the graph hitherto used.

³ Τέθνηκα of course is the perfect of ἀποθνήσκω: a perfect needed no perfectivising in a “point-word” like this.

⁴ Note that in all three the simplex is obsolete, for the same reason in each case.

σῶσον, ἀπολλύμεθα, we recognise in the perfective verb the sense of an absolutely *inevitable* doom, even though the subsequent story tells us it was averted. In οἱ ἀπολλύμενοι, strongly durative though the verb is, we see its perfectivity in the fact that the goal is *ideally* reached: only a complete transformation of its subjects brings them out of the doom their state necessarily involves.

“The perfective *Aktionsart* in Polybius,” the earliest of the great Κοινή writers, forms the subject of an elaborate study by Dr. Eleanor Purdie, of Newnham College, in Brugmann and Streitberg’s *Indo-germanische Forschungen* for 1898 (pp. 63–153). A comparison of Miss Purdie’s results with those derivable from the New Testament Greek gives much point to Brugmann’s remark (*Griech. Gram.*³ p. 484) that research in this field is still in its initial stages. Miss Purdie shows that since Homer the aorist simplex has been progressively taking the constative colour, at the expense of its earlier *punktuell*¹ character; and that there is a growing tendency to use the compounds, especially those with *διά*, *κατά* and *σύν*, to express what in the oldest Greek could be sufficiently indicated by the simplex. To a certain extent the New Testament use agrees with that of Polybius. Thus *φυγεῖν* is constative eleven times, “to flee,” with no suggestion of the prolongation of flight (*φεύγειν*) or of its successful accomplishment (*διαφυγεῖν* or *καταφυγεῖν*).² Here the papyri are decidedly in agreement. *Διῶξαι* also is always con-

¹ Miss Purdie calls this “perfective” also: Brugmann, following Delbrück, has since insisted on reserving “perfective” for the compound verbs. Unity of technical terms is so vital that I adapt the writer’s phraseology to that of the highest authority.

² Matt. xxiii. 33 is, I think, “how are ye to *flee from* the judgment of Gehenna?” (cf. iii. 7). The thought is not the inevitableness of God’s punishment, but the stubbornness of men who will not take a step to escape it. Similarly, in Hebrews xi. 34 we have *ἔφυγον* for the *beginning* of action—not the goal of safety attained, but the first and decisive step away from danger. The perfective therefore would be inappropriate.

stative, while the perfective *καταδιῶξαι*, "hunt down," occurs once in Mark i. 36, where "followed after" needs correction. *Ἐργάσασθαι* is certainly constative in Matthew xxv. 16, 3 John 5, and Hebrews xi. 33: it surveys in perspective the continuous labour which is so often expressed by *ἐργάζεσθαι*. In Matthew xxvi. 10, and even 2 John 8, I think the same is the case: the stress lies on the *work* rather than on accomplishment. This last idea is regularly denoted by the perfective compound with *κατά*. *Φυλάξαι* "guard" is, I think, always constative, *διαφυλάξαι* "preserve" occurring in Luke iv. 10. Similarly *τηρῆσαι* "watch, keep," a continuous process seen in perspective: *συν-* and *δια-τηρεῖν* (present stem only) denote watching which achieves its purpose up to the point of time contemplated. *Ἀγωνίζεσθαι* is only used in the durative present, but *καταγωνίσασθαι* (Heb. xi. 33) is a good perfective. *Φαγεῖν* and *καταφαγεῖν* are quite on Polybian lines (see above). On the other hand, in the verbs Miss Purdie examines, there is decidedly less use of the compound in the New Testament than in Polybius, and the non-constative aorists which she notes as exceptions to the general tendency are reinforced by others which in Polybius are not usually such. Thus *ιδεῖν* is comparatively rare in Polybius: "in several cases the meaning is purely constative, and those exx. in which a perfective meaning¹ must be admitted bear a very small proportion to the extremely frequent occurrences of the compound verb in the like sense" (*op. cit.* p. 94 f.). In the New Testament, however, the simplex *ιδεῖν* is exceedingly common, while the compound (*καθορᾶν*, Rom. i. 20) only appears once. It is moreover—so far as I can judge without the labour of a count—as often *punktuell* (ingressive) as constative: Matthew ii. 10, "when they caught sight

¹ That is, *punktuell*: Miss Purdie does not distinguish this from *perfective* proper (with preposition).

of the star," will serve as an example, against constative uses like that in the previous verse, "the star which they saw." (In very many cases it would be difficult to distinguish the one from the other.) There are in the New Testament no perfective compounds of *θεάομαι*, *θεωρέω*, *λογίζομαι*, *πράσσω*, *κινδυνεύω*, *ἄρχομαι*, *μέλλω*, *ὀργίζομαι*, *δύνω*, or *μίσγω* (*μίγνυμι*), to set by those given from the historian. *Νοέω* is somewhat obscure, and does not very easily conform to the Polybian rule. The present is probably "use the mind, understand," in durative sense; the aorist in John xii. 40 and Ephesians iii. 4 may be the constative of this. But *κατανοῆσαι* on this principle should be "realise," with point action (effective): this will suit Luke xx. 23, and in the present stem Matthew vii. 3 and Acts xxvii. 39 (? "noticed one after another"). Another perfective force might be "fix the mind on," which will with some pressure account for the other occurrences. *Μαθεῖν* is sometimes constative, summing up the process of *μανθάνειν*, but has often purely point action, "ascertain, learn": so Acts xxiii. 27, Galatians iii. 2, and probably elsewhere, also often in the papyri. *Καταμάθετε τὰ κρίνα*, Matthew vi. 28, is, I think, better rendered "understand" ("take in this fact about"), which brings it into line: Luke's parallel *κατανοήσατε* will, as we have seen, bear nearly the same meaning. The use of *τελέω* differs widely from that in Polybius, where the perfective compound (*συντ.*) greatly predominates, while in the New Testament the simplex is four times as common. In the latter, moreover, the aorist is always *punktuell*, "finish": only in Gal. v. 16 is the constative "perform" a possible alternative. *Ὀργισθῆναι* is another divergent, for instead of the perfective *διοργ.* "fly into a rage" we six times have the simplex in the New Testament, where the constative aorist "be angry" never occurs.¹ Finally we

¹ Rev. xi. 18 might be translated "were angry," but the ingressive

note that *καθέζεσθαι* is always purely durative in New Testament ("sit," not "sit down," which is *καθίσαι*), thus differing from Polybian use.

The net result of this comparison may perhaps be stated thus, provisionally: for anything like a decisive settlement we must wait for some *χαλκέντερος* grammarian who will plod right through the papyri and the *Κοινή* literature with minuteness to match Miss Purdie's over her six books of Polybius—a task for which a year's holiday is a *condicio sine qua non*. The growth of the constative aorist is a feature of later Greek which may be regarded as undeniable: its consequences will occupy us when we come to the consideration of the Tenses, to which we turn next month. But the disuse of the "point" aorist, ingressive or effective, and the preference of the perfective compound to express its meaning, will naturally vary very much with the author. The general tendency may be allowed as proved; the extent of its working will depend on the personal equation. In the use of compound verbs, especially, we cannot expect the *negligé* style of ordinary conversation, or even the highest degree of elaboration to which Luke or the *auctor ad Hebraeos* could rise, to come near the profusion of a literary man like Polybius.

I hope that this brief account of recent researches, in a field hitherto almost untried by New Testament scholars, may suffice to prepare the way for the necessary attempt to place on a scientific basis the use of the tenses, a subject on which many of the most crucial questions of exegesis depend. I have, I trust, made it clear that the notion of present or past *time* is not by any means the first thing we must think of in dealing with tenses. For our problems of *Aktionsart* it is a mere accident that *φεύγω* is (generally) present and *ἔφευγον*, *ἔφυγον* and *φυγών*

"waxed angry" (at the accession of the King) suits the previous verse much better.

past: the first point we must settle is the distinction between $\phi\epsilon\nu\gamma$ and $\phi\nu\gamma$ which is common to all their moods. The superstructure which grew up mainly through the intrusion of that little adverb ϵ -, still detachable as any other preposition in the earliest extant Greek, will be the subject of our next inquiry.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

THE REVISED VERSION OF THE NEW
TESTAMENT: A REPLY.

IN the September number of the EXPOSITOR, the Rev. J. B. McClellan, M.A., puts in "a new and earnest plea for hesitation" against "proposals urged from time to time for the more extended use of the Revised Version, whether in public or in private, in preference to the Authorised Version." He admits "that the R.V. advantageously removes various obsolete expressions and other minor defects of the A.V., and throws light on sundry obscure passages"; but adds that "it must still be firmly asserted that it is burdened with more serious inaccuracies than it removes, and that, upon the whole, it falls far short of the merits of the Old Version."

In support of this sweeping condemnation, Mr. McClellan appeals only, as specimens, to "*erroneous renderings*" of seven passages taken from the Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, and Colossians; and endeavours to "indicate the seriousness of their character." The many changes in the Greek text adopted and translated by the Revisers, he dismisses with an unproved assertion that they were "unduly influenced . . . by an over-estimate, at that time, of certain ancient authorities." As the whole question is one of comparative value, he ought to have quoted, at least in these epistles, the chief passages in which the

supporters of the R.V. claim for its superiority. But this he has not done.

In this paper I shall say a few words about the seven passages on which our critic relies; and shall then adduce others, confining myself to the same four epistles, in which the R.V. contains improvements far outweighing all that can be said against these seven renderings.

Objection is taken to the R.V. rendering of Rom. iii. 9, "Are we in worse case than they?" compared with the A.V., "Are we better *than they*?" This objection seems to me to have some force: for it is very difficult to find any example of *προέχουσαι* in the sense adopted by the Revisers. But Mr. McClellan admits that "there is apparently no extant example" of the meaning given in the A.V. to "the middle voice" of this verb. So far both versions fall under the same condemnation. Fortunately, the Revisers give in the margin an alternative rendering, "do we excuse ourselves?" for which Mr. McClellan admits that "there are extant examples in the sense of *holding in front of oneself* as a shield, pretext, etc." This seems to me to be Paul's meaning. He asks, in reference to the dilemma in vv. 5-8, which alternative do we take? Is it our object to prove that there are no moral distinctions and will be no judgment? Are we, by stating this alternative, *holding before ourselves* a shield behind which we may escape punishment?

In any case, whatever be the correct rendering, the whole matter is unimportant. None of the three renderings will lead any one seriously astray. The A.V. gives one for which no extant example can be found: the R.V. gives two, each grammatically admissible; one of them affording a good sense.

The next passage quoted is Rom. v. 1, "Being therefore justified by faith, let us have peace with God."

Here I must admit that the R.V. rendering is open to

serious objection. For, if a man is "justified," he has already, by the meaning of the words used, "peace with God." But the Greek text underlying this rendering is found in all existing Greek MSS. earlier than the ninth century, in all the earliest versions, and in the early commentaries of Origen and Chrysostom. The reading underlying the A.V. rendering, "we have peace with God," is destitute of any early and good documentary evidence. To set aside this almost universal testimony of all our best witnesses is simple desperation; and cannot be tolerated for a moment except under absolute necessity. The Revisers' mistake seems to me to be in their rendering, which should be "Let us then, justified by faith, have peace with God"; in accordance with a very common use of the Greek aorist particle preceding a verb in the subjunctive mood, where other languages would use two subjunctives. So 1 Cor. vi. 15, Acts xv. 36, Eph. iv. 25, etc. Paul here encourages his readers to pass through the gate of justification into an abiding state of peace with God.

But here again, whatever fault be found with the R.V. rendering, its underlying text is right; and the A.V. is undoubtedly wrong. Moreover the R.V. gives both readings, thus calling attention to a real difficulty which the A.V. passes over in silence.

These two difficult passages are all that Mr. McClellan has to bring against the R.V. in the Epistle to the Romans. What is to be said on the other side?

In ch. iv. 19, the word *not*, in the phrase "considered *not* his own body now dead," is omitted by all the critical editors, in all the best Greek MSS. and the best early versions, and by the great Greek commentators Origen and Chrysostom. Such evidence cannot be lightly set aside: and it changes the sense of the verse. The strength of Abraham's faith was shown in that he deliberately con-

templated and took into account the physical difficulties in the way of the fulfilment of the promise; and that in spite of them his faith did not waver. All this is obscured in the A.V.: but the change in the R.V. calls attention to it.

A similar unanimity of the best documents and editors omits, in ch. vi. 12, two short words which perceptibly alter the sense of the verse. We are warned, not against obeying *sin* in the desires of the body, but against obeying the desires of the body, and thus permitting sin to make our mortal body its throne. The correct text calls attention to the immoral influence exerted by the body, acting, through its desires, upon the spirit within, sin thus using the lower to dominate the higher; a thought ever present to Paul, but much less prominent now.

Other corrections in the text, adopted by all Critical Editors, and by the Revisers, and perceptibly affecting the sense, are found in chs. vii. 6, viii. 1, x. 17, xi. 6, xiv. 6, 10, xv. 24, 29, xvi. 24.

Of improvements in rendering, without change in the underlying Greek text, I notice the following. In chs. i. 17, iii. 21, 22, x. 3, the phrase, "the righteousness of God," suggests irresistibly God's attribute of righteousness. But, that this was not Paul's thought, is proved by its utter incompatibility with the context. For God's righteousness was not revealed in the Gospel, but long before; nor is it in any special sense revealed "by faith," nor is it supported by the quotation from Hab. ii. 4, "the just one by faith shall live"; nor can it be said to be "manifested apart from law," nor were the Jews in Paul's day "ignorant of it." This unsuitability to the context, and to the whole epistle, compels us to seek for another explanation. A key is found in Phil. iii. 9: "and be found in Him, not having a righteousness of my own, viz., that from law, but that which is through faith of Christ, the right-

eousness from God on the condition of faith." This divinely given righteousness is the chief matter of the Gospel: it comes through faith apart from works of law, and was unknown to the unbelieving Jews. That this is Paul's meaning is made clear by the evidently equivalent phrases, "justified by faith," and "faith reckoned for righteousness," in chs. iii. 26-30, iv. 2-24. In the A.V. all this is obscured by a familiar, but misleading expression, "the righteousness of God": on the other hand, the clumsy R.V. rendering, a "righteousness of God," calls attention to a matter needing further examination. This is no small gain, and the matter which Paul is here discussing is of infinite importance.

A very important correction is found in ch. iii. 25, where instead of, "for the remission of sins that are past," words which add nothing to the sense of the passage, we now read, "because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime." Paul teaches that the setting forth of Christ in His blood to be a propitiation through faith was prompted by God's earlier forbearance in apparently tolerating sin, as though this tolerance had obscured His righteousness which must now be vindicated by the death of Christ. The words we are considering connect the mercy of God in passing over sin in earlier ages with the supreme sacrifice in Paul's day on the cross. By the R.V. this important element of teaching is rescued for the English reader.

The rendering of *διά* with gen. by the word *through* in Rom. v. 2 (5), 10, 11, 12 twice, 16, 17 twice, 18 twice, 19 twice, 21; instead of (A.V.) *by*, is of importance: for throughout the New Testament this Greek preposition represents Christ as the channel or agent or instrument of whatever God does in creation or redemption (cp. 1 Cor. viii. 6, John i. 3, 10). Another relation of Christ to the same is represented by the preposition *ἐν*, which the

Revisers have done well to reproduce by the word *in* in Rom. vi. 11, 23, instead of (A.V.) *through*, thus bringing it into line with the same preposition in ch. viii. 1, 2, 39. It represents Christ as the environment, and refuge, and home, and vital atmosphere, of the Christian life. This important element in the teaching of Paul and John is in John xv. 1-7 traced, in the parable of the vine, to the lips of Christ. The distinction of these two prepositions *through* and *by* in the R.V., representing two relations of Christ to man and to the universe, is an important gain.

In Rom. vii. 7, 8, the uniform rendering *covet* three times with *lust* in the margin, indicates the line of argument, which is obscured by the changing A.V. rendering, *lust*, *covet*, and *concupiscence*. But the rendering *lust* or *covet* is not the best. For these are always bad, whereas the Greek original (*ἐπιθυμία*) is neutral, and denotes only *desire* (cp. Luke xxii. 15, 1 Thess. ii. 17). The awkwardness of the R.V. rendering is very conspicuous in Gal. v. 17: for we cannot attribute *lust* to the Holy Spirit.

The rather clumsy note to Rom. ix. 5, "Some modern interpreters place a full stop after *flesh*, etc.," does good service by calling attention to the ambiguity of the verse, which may be either an assertion that Christ "is over all, God blessed for ever," or a doxology to the Father, "God who is over all be blessed for ever." This last exposition is adopted by the editors, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Hort, and by the great grammatical commentator Meyer; the former by the editors Tregelles and Westcott, and by most English commentators. Not only fairness but truth demand that this uncertainty find expression in our copies of the New Testament.

Even the rendering *Elijah* in Rom. xi. 2 and throughout the N.T., and especially *Elisha* in Luke iv. 27, are no small help to the English reader.

In 1 Cor. vi. 7, our critic blames the Revisers for replacing the A.V. "there is utterly a fault among you" by R.V. "already it is altogether a defect in you," with "a loss to you" in the margin, as an alternative. But the word *already* is an accurate rendering of the conspicuous Greek word ἤδη; which in the A.V. is overlooked. Indeed, Mr. McClellan adopts it in his own rendering, "Nay, already it is a *defeat* to you." This last is perhaps better than the R.V. rendering. But it is not suggested by the A.V. "there is utterly a fault among you," which he is writing to defend, and which omits the important word *already*, made prominent by the Revisers.

A similarly trifling objection is made to the R.V. rendering of 1 Cor. xv. 27. But so far as I can understand our critic, his objection is equally valid against the A.V.; and his own rendering is given in the R.V. margin. His note is a marvel of meaningless perplexity. That he finds no fault with the Revisers' translation of a long epistle, except these two criticisms, is a strong commendation of their work.

In 2 Cor. ii. 14 Mr. McClellan blames the Revisers for replacing the A.V., "thanks be to God which always *causeth us to triumph* in Christ," by "*leadeth us in triumph.*" But he admits that the causative sense given in the A.V. to the word θριαμβεύω is never found in extant Greek literature. The R.V. rendering gives to it its ordinary meaning, as in Col. ii. 15. To set this meaning aside, and give to the word a meaning not found elsewhere, cannot be tolerated unless the ordinary meaning gives no worthy sense. But this is not the case here. The Roman triumph suggests a good meaning. Paul thinks of his life of wandering and hardship, driven from Ephesus by a tumult and from Troas by anxiety about the Corinthian Christians. But he remembers that, just as in the Roman triumphs the long and sad train of captives and

booty revealed the greatness of the victory and the victor, so his own long and weary wanderings over sea and land revealed the grandeur of God. Perhaps his words were suggested in part by the thought, ever present to him, of his former hostility to Christ. As a captive, he is led along: and his absolute submission, shown in his apostolic work, reveals the completeness of the victory of Him against whom Paul once fought. Surely this exposition, which gives to a not uncommon Greek word its ordinary meaning, is better than the violence done to it in the earlier version.

The only other passage mentioned in the Epistles to the Corinthians is 2 Cor iii. 18. Here I agree with Mr. McClellan that the A.V. rendering *beholding* is better than the R.V. *reflecting*. But the rendering displaced is put in the margin as an alternative. Moreover, as some compensation for this loss, as he and I understand it, we have the rendering *mirror* instead of *glass*; and *unveiled* instead of the meaningless words, "with *open face*." The former change gives to the verse at once an intelligible meaning, whereas the rendering *glass*, which the Revisers set aside, is, until explained, altogether indefinite. The change from "*open face*" to "*unveiled face*," and that in ch. iv. 3 from *hid* to *veiled*, are an immense gain: for they recall at once the word *veil* four times in vv. 13, 14, 15, 16, and thus forming a continuous thread running through and binding together ch. iii. 13-iv. 3; and making the whole a reference to the remarkable incident in Exod. xxxiv. 29-35. Of this great gain, which illumines the whole passage, as a compensation for the defective rendering *reflecting* instead of *beholding*, which moreover is given in the margin, nothing is said in the paper before us.

Such are all the objections brought against the R.V. of Paul's letters to Corinth. But many improvements are passed over in silence. Of these I note the following.

In 1 Cor. vii. 5. the words "fasting and" are omitted by all editors. This omission gains importance from the fact that the references to fasting in Matt. xvii. 21, Mark ix. 29 are also open to serious doubt. The word *all-things* (R.V. and all editors) instead of *this* (A.V.), in 1 Cor. ix. 23, gives to Paul's words a much wider scope. He is prepared, not only to become weak for the weak, but to do all things within his power to save men around him. In ch. x. 1, the word *for*, instead of *moreover*, makes the examples taken from the story of Israel in the wilderness a confirmation of the warnings in ch. ix. 24-27. The preposition added in 2 Cor. ii. 16, and rendered "*from* death . . . *from* life," instead of "*of* death . . . *of* life," gives an intelligible meaning to Paul's words, viz., an influence going forth *from* life and *from* death, and producing life and death respectively. Such is, in different persons, the different effect of the Gospel he preaches. Also more correct in ch. v. 14 is the reading rendered "we judge that one died for all, therefore all died"; instead of "*if* one died, etc." The omission of "all things" by all editors in v. 17 is also correct.

Much more important than the above corrections of the Greek text are several improvements in translation. In 1 Cor. i. 18 the rendering "are perishing . . . are being saved" reproduces, much better than does the A.V. "perish . . . are saved," the force of the Greek present participle, which denotes a process now going on. In 1 Cor. ix. 25, the A.V. rendering, "every man that striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things," is utter nonsense. The R.V. rendering, "striveth in the games," at least suggests inquiry, and points to the Greek athletic contests so often referred to by Paul as a metaphor of the Christian life. In v. 27, the rendering, "buffet my body," with "bruise" in the margin, recalls (cf. v. 26) the action of a boxer, which is altogether overlooked by the A.V. rendering, "keep under my body."

Far more important than the above, is the rendering *covenant* with *testament* in the margin in 1 Cor. xi. 25, "this cup is the new *covenant* in my blood"; and in Luke xxii. 20, 2 Cor. iii. 6, 14. For it recalls at once Jer. xxxi. 31: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new *covenant* with the house of Israel . . . not according to the *covenant* that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my *covenant* they brake." Our Lord asserts, as recorded in 1 Cor. xi. 25, Luke xxii. 20, that the time had come, foreseen by the ancient prophet, and that God was about to enter into a new relation to men, more glorious than that into which He entered with Israel at the Exodus. This all-important reference is altogether overlooked in the Authorised Version. It gives an entirely new significance to these solemn words of Christ.

Another great gain is the word *love*, which every one understands, instead of *charity* in 1 Cor. viii. 1, xiii. 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 13, xiv. 1, Rom. xiv. 15, etc. For it puts these passages in relation to the unique attribute of *love* in 1 Cor. viii. 3, 2 Cor. v. 14, Rom. v. 5, 8, viii. 35, 39, John iii. 16, 1 John iv. 7-21, etc. The omission of the word *unknown* from 1 Cor. xiv. 2, 4, 13, 14, 19, 27 removes a misconception of the real nature of the mysterious gift of tongues, which was certainly not a talking in a foreign language.

Better renderings are given in 2 Cor. iii. 5, "our sufficiency is *from* God," instead of "*of* God"; and in v. 7, "which *glory* was passing away," instead of "to be done away." Unfortunately we have in ch. v. 13 a worse rendering, "if we are beside ourselves, it is unto God; or whether we are of sober mind, it is *unto* you"; instead of (A.V.) "for your cause." The R.V. "*unto* God . . . *unto* you," is meaningless nonsense. The correct rendering of

the Greek dative of advantage is "if we have become beside ourselves, it is *for God*; and if we are of sober mind, it is *for you*": so seven times (R.V.) and six times (A.V.) in 1 Cor. vi. 12, 13. This uncouth and very frequent rendering of a common Greek grammatical form is a serious blemish of the Revised Version.

The passage quoted from Col. ii. 15 is one of the most difficult in the New Testament. Here, as in Rom. iii. 9, Mr. McClellan asks us to interpret a middle or passive voice ἀπεκδυσάμενος as though it were active; without giving any reason why one voice is put in place of another. The R.V. seems to me to give a correct and intelligible sense. In any case it does not lead the English reader seriously astray.

Such are all the proofs adduced in support of the sweeping assertion that the "blemishes and imperfections" of the A.V. "fade almost into insignificance in comparison with the serious errors of the Revised." If the above are specimens, these errors are not serious: and they are surpassed in importance by the improvements mentioned in this paper.

Undoubtedly, the R.V. has many defects. The Revisers were too confident of the excellence of their work; and expected that it would be at once accepted by the nation with humble gratitude because of the authority of those who made it. They have been rudely undeceived. Perhaps it would have been better to have submitted it for public criticism before issue of the final edition. On the other hand, they may have feared that a public outcry might have compelled them to retreat from their position of absolute loyalty to the best results of modern scholarship.

This last is the chief and great gain of the Revised Version. The version used in our childhood as God's word written was based on a Greek text now known, by

the unanimous testimony of all those who have devoted themselves to a critical study of it, to be, in many important passages, incorrect. Any one, with any claim or with no claim to scholarship, was at liberty to correct it. This was a serious element of uncertainty surrounding all study of the English Bible. The readers of the Revised Version know now that, within the limits marked out by its marginal notes, the translation they use rests upon a text almost as near to the actual words of the Evangelists and Apostles as modern scholarship permits. This is the chief gain of the new version. After much careful study I am convinced that, with a few serious blemishes, also the English rendering, uncouth as it sometimes is, gives us the sense intended by the Sacred Writers much more accurately than does any earlier translation.

Moreover, we are not likely to have, for a long time to come, a better English version. Do not let us neglect the best available because it is not perfect.

In public worship, the Church listens to the divinely-given records of the supreme revelation given to men in Christ, and of earlier revelations leading up to it. Surely we are bound to put these records before the Church in the form most nearly approaching that intended by the Sacred Writers. For private study, few will deny the superiority of the Revised Version. How small and few are the objections to it, we may learn from Mr. McClellan's paper. In full view of all that can be said against it, the English reader may well be grateful that he possesses the sacred volume in a form embodying so well the best scholarship of all the ages.

JOSEPH AGAR BEET.

A MESSIANIC PROPHECY.

(MICAH iv. 8—v. 6 [HEB. v. 5]).

[Chapter iii. closes with the announcement of a signal judgement on Zion: *Zion shall be plowed as a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps* (ver. 12). Chapter iv. opens (vers. 1-7) with a splendid vision of future glories. Thus a great gap in thought is left between the two passages, for we are not told how disaster is to issue in triumph. The explanation follows, however, in chapter iv. 8—v. 6, in which the Person is introduced through whom the transition is made from present distress to the great Restoration.]

THE PROMISE OF THE KINGDOM, IV. 8.

AND THOU, O tower of the flock, hill of the daughter of Zion, unto thee shall it come; yea, the former dominion shall come, the kingdom of the daughter of Jerusalem.

The sense of this verse is quite clear. A particular part of Jerusalem is addressed, namely, the Hill of Zion, the low south-east corner of the city, which was in a special sense *the City of David*. It was the spot which he had taken from the Jebusites, and made his own dwelling-place, moving northwards from his old capital Hebron, when he became king over all Israel. Thus at the outset the Messianic note is struck in this passage: *Back to David*, the king whom God Himself chose in the days of old.

But the cry of this verse is not only *Back to David*, but also *Back to the older Israel*, the Israel of David's day. The prophet addresses the hill of Zion by an unexpected epithet, *Tower of the Flock* or *Flock-tower*. He closes his eyes to the great walled city of his own day, to the Jerusalem, which after all (be it remembered) defied the Assyrian, the great taker of cities, and he sees in vision the little Davidic fort of old days, which just sufficed as a refuge for the nearest flocks when an enemy was ravaging the land. To the little Flock-tower of times long gone by,

not to the great fortress of the Present, does the Prophet make the great promise.

It is very important, if we wish to understand the prophets of the eighth century, to realize what an offence to these men of God were the strong cities of Israel and Judah. Jerusalem itself, as a fortress, was no exception. To take refuge in stone walls was, in the eyes of Hosea (viii. 14), Isaiah (xvii. 7-9, xxii. 8-11, xxvii. 9, 10, xxxii. 13-20) and Micah, *to forget* *JEHOVAH, Israel's Maker*. The prophet therefore makes his promise here not to the Great City, the pride of its inhabitants, but to one quarter of it, to which certain ancient memories were attached.

The promise made to the "Flock-tower" is that *the former dominion shall come to her*. In other words, the Davidic kingdom, rent in pieces under Rehoboam, shall be restored. It is just such another promise indeed as that cited by St. James in Acts xv. 16 from Amos ix. 11, *In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof; and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old*. We should call both promises "Messianic."

PRESENT SUFFERING, FUTURE DELIVERANCE, Vers. 9, 10.

NOW why dost thou cry out aloud? Is there no king in thee, is thy counsellor perished, that pangs have taken hold of thee, as of a woman in travail? Be in pain and labour to bring forth, O daughter of Zion, like a woman in travail: for now shalt thou go forth out of the city, and shalt dwell in the field . . . ; there shalt thou be rescued; there shall the LORD redeem thee from the hand of thine enemies.

In this passage as I have given it, an omission is to be noticed; the words, *and shalt come even unto Babylon*, are absent. After careful consideration I am driven to the conclusion of Drs. Driver (*LOT*, 1898), G. A. Smith (with a "perhaps," *The XII. Prophets*, 1896), and W. Nowack

(*Handkommentar*, 1897) that these words are a mistaken gloss, which has inadvertently been transferred from the margin to the text. There is nothing arbitrary in this view. The brief clause in which Babylon is mentioned constitutes a real and serious difficulty, for it is alien to the whole context in which it stands. That context speaks of Assyrians, not Chaldeans, of Invasion, not Captivity, of troubles which have already begun, not of those which are still far distant. The passage as a whole is attributed with good reason to Micah, the contemporary of Hezekiah and Sennacherib, but the clause which mentions deportation to Babylon as a present danger is not to be assigned on any reasonable ground to a prophet who lived more than 100 years before Nebuchadrezzar.

The words, then, *and shalt come even unto Babylon* are alien from the general context, and ought to be struck out as a gloss and incorrect. This conclusion may be supported by a second consideration, namely, that the preceding clause remains meaningless so long as this reference to deportation to Babylon is retained. *Thou shalt dwell in the field and shalt come even unto Babylon* is at the best a ὑστερον πρότερον, for the removal to Babylon would naturally precede the settlement in new surroundings. But even so the expression seems too harsh to be possible. The clause, *Thou shalt dwell in the field*, taken by itself,¹ bears a sufficient meaning, which is only obscured by the second clause with its reference to Babylon.

How then are vers. 9, 10 to be interpreted? The verses contain (as we see at once) two things, (a) an announcement of a great crisis coming upon the daughter of Zion, (b) an attempt on the part of the prophet to administer comfort. We have to ask two questions, What is the nature of the crisis? and, What is the ground of the comfort?

¹ See below in the exposition of ver. 10.

To take the second question first, What is the meaning of the words of comfort which the prophet addresses to his people in their alarm, *Why dost thou cry out aloud? Is there no king in thee, is thy counsellor perished?* Zion's king, her counsellor, in the mouth of one of the great prophets of the eighth century, can be none other than JEHOVAH Himself. It is nothing to the point to say that Hezekiah was reigning in Jerusalem. Read the prophecies of the First Isaiah, and see how much (or rather how little) can by any means be supposed to refer to the reigning prince of Judah. To men like Isaiah and Micah, who had so vivid a sense of the presence of the Eternal King, the earthly king was a person of little significance. Their inmost thought rings out in the words, *The Lord is our judge, the Lord is our lawgiver, the Lord is our King; he will save us* (Isa. xxxiii. 22). The comfort, then, which Micah gives in ver. 9 answers fully to another utterance of Isaiah, *Cry aloud and shout, thou inhabitant of Zion: for great is the Holy One of Israel in the midst of thee* (xii. 6).

We have now to ask, What is the nature of the crisis indicated in ver. 10? If (now that the gloss is removed) exile to Babylon is not threatened, what is the prospect to which Micah points and from which Zion averts her gaze? The words of the prophet are simple, so simple as at first sight to create a difficulty by their very simplicity: *Now shalt thou go forth out of the city, and shalt dwell in the field; there shalt thou be rescued* (תִּנְצַלִי). We have here, as plainly expressed as may be, the great prophetic thought already referred to, that Israel's fortified cities are his weakness, not his strength; God's deliverance will not come to Zion until Zion has surrendered her confidence in human defences and has thrown herself upon her LORD. Micah's demand is for a transformed Zion, a disarmed Zion, looking to her Maker, and not to the

fortifications of Jerusalem. The prophet expostulates with the

“ . . . Heathen heart that puts her trust
 In reeking tube and iron shard,
 All valiant dust that builds on dust,
 And guarding, calls not Thee to guard.”

Some interpreters give a more definite interpretation of the words than this. Thus Dr. Driver suggests that ver. 10 “ describes how the inhabitants, having been compelled to surrender their capital to the foe, encamp in the fields on the road for exile, when JEHOVAH interposes suddenly on their behalf, and there delivers them.” I must doubt, however, whether the words can be so precisely applied. The enemy, according to the context, has not yet entered Judah (chap. v. 5, 6), so that detailed references to the course of the campaign are not *à priori* to be expected. But there is a more serious consideration to be faced. The analogy of prophetic usage, and in particular the analogy of the usage of Isaiah in relation to this very crisis, is against such an interpretation of Micah’s words.

We do not find in the prophecies of the son of Amoz a string of predictions describing, months in advance, the exact course of the Assyrian invasion. Isaiah’s utterances are reiterated appeals for Faith in JEHOVAH, reiterated protests against putting trust in an arm of flesh, whether that *arm of flesh* is represented by the strength of Jerusalem, as in chap. xxii., or by the horses and chariots of the Egyptians, as in chaps. xxx., xxxi. Deliverance is promised in return for faith; but in his earlier prophecies Isaiah does not say how the deliverance is to come. Some of these utterances are consistent with an expectation that deliverance would be delayed, until Jerusalem had fallen into the hands of the Assyrians. The important fact to remember is, however, that Isaiah does not tie his promise of salvation for his people to some outward event, such as

a successful defence of Mount Zion. It is not till the Rabshakeh has summoned Jerusalem to surrender that the decisive promise is given, "I will defend this city to save it."

This prophecy of Micah (which synchronizes with the earlier prophecies of Isaiah) is, I believe, of the same character with them. We may say, if we will, that ver. 10 is consistent with an expectation that Jerusalem would be forced to capitulate, but we shall find ourselves in grave difficulties if we take the words as a direct prediction of a surrender. We shall miss the connexion with the great prophetic thought of which I spoke at the beginning.

The verse speaks broadly of a return from the life of cities, a life corrupting to simplicity and corrupting to Faith, back to the earlier life, the simple country life of the Davidic age. Micah asks for a turning away from the luxury of great cities and from confidence in stone walls, back to a lowly life in the field and to faith in the God of David, *Now shalt thou go forth out of the city, and shalt dwell in the field.* We may compare Isa. xxxii. 14, 16, *The palace shall be forsaken, the populous city shall be deserted . . . Then judgement shall dwell in the wilderness* (i.e. in the pasture lands), *and righteousness shall abide in the fruitful field.* Thus shall the new redeemed Israel dwell.

THE GATHERING IN OF THE NATIONS, Vers. 11-13.

And now many nations are assembled against thee that say, Let her be defiled, and let our eye see its desire upon Zion. But they know not the thoughts of the LORD, neither understand they his counsel: for he hath gathered them as the sheaves to the threshing-floor. Arise and thresh, O daughter of Zion: for I will make thy horn iron, and I will make thy hoofs brass: and thou shalt beat fine many peoples; and thou

shalt devote their gain unto the LORD, and their substance (or their host) unto the Lord of the whole earth.

At first sight these verses seem to describe the overthrow and spoiling inflicted upon Israel's foes; Zion turns upon her enemies and pulverizes them. I doubt whether this is an adequate interpretation of the words, I doubt whether it is right even in the main. The words, indeed, describe a judgement on the heathen, and express a thought which is found also in Isaiah, namely, that judgement on Israel is followed by judgement on Israel's foes (Isa. x. 12). But is it a judgement unto death? Here the nations (be it noted!) are not burnt like stubble, nor cast out into the street like clay, they are gathered as wheat into the threshing-floor, and after a process of severe trial their gain, and their host, are devoted to the LORD. In the light of the conversion of the Gentiles mentioned at the beginning of the chapter (vers. 1-3), I believe that the main thought of these final verses is that the nations, after judgement has been held, will be gathered in to the people of God.

A FRESH CONTEMPLATION OF THE PRESENT DISTRESS,

Chapter v. 1.

Now shalt thou perform thy mourning, O daughter of mourning: he hath laid siege against us: they shall smite the judge of Israel with a rod upon the cheek.

With this we may compare Isaiah xxii. 12: *In that day*

¹ The translation *assemble in troops* (A.V. and R.V.) for the Hebrew *hithgōdēd* is very uncertain, even in Jeremiah v. 7, where some reference to Adonis-worship is probable, and the alternative translation *cut oneself* (in sign of mourning) is entirely suitable. On the other hand, *daughter of mourning* (*daughter of troops*, A.V. and R.V.) for the Hebrew *bath gedud* stand on its own merits derived from the immediate context. If *tithgōdēdā* be rightly explained as "perform thy mourning," *gēdād*, which is derived from the same root, can hardly mean anything else than *mourning*. At the same time it must be acknowledged that the only direct support for this rendering is derived from the occurrence of a plural *gēdādōh*, "cuttings made in mourning" in Jeremiah xlvi. 37.

did the Lord GOD of Hosts call to weeping, and to mourning, and to baldness, and to girding with sackcloth. The words announce that the crisis is at hand. For "he hath laid siege" we should translate "he is about to lay siege." As to the result nothing is said except that the judge of Israel, i.e. Hezekiah will soon be exposed to reproach which he cannot turn away.

THE GREAT SHEPHERD OF THE HOUSE OF DAVID,

Vers. 2-4.

AND THOU, Bethlehem Ephrathah, which art little to be among the thousands of Judah, out of thee shall one come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth are from of old, from everlasting. Therefore will he give them up, until Time which travaileth hath brought forth: then the residue of his brethren shall return unto the children of Israel. And he shall stand, and shall feed his flock in the strength of the LORD, in the majesty of the name of the LORD his God: and they shall abide; for now shall he be great unto the ends of the earth.

With this address to Bethlehem, the second city which bears the title of *the City of David*, the prophet recalls his hearers to the Messianic hopes which were heard in chap. iv. 8, the hopes which give the keynote for this whole passage. The prophet passes over the Present, and passes by Hezekiah the ruler of the day, and looks back to the beginnings of the ancient house of David for an ideal king, for one who is truly Davidic. The prophets of Judah never forgot that JEHOVAH had once chosen David to be king. His house had received the Divine promises, and with his house was bound up a hope which could never be quenched. The anointed king, King Messiah, was expected from this ancient source; He is described as one *whose goings forth are from of old, from ancient days.*

As to the time at which the Deliverer is expected, the

prophet speaks with prophetic reserve. It will be, he says, in the fulness of time, *when Time which travaileth hath brought forth*. Then, he adds, the exiles of the Northern Kingdom will return home. The ideal king will rule, and rule long, for he does all in the strength of JEHOVAH; his kingdom shall make itself felt to the ends of the earth.

We are often told that the Prophets prophesied to their own age, and stood in direct relation to their own time. This statement is true, and it needed to be stated with all the more emphasis in modern days, because there *was* a tendency (old-fashioned now) to read prophetic books as though they had little or no context in the history of the eighth and seventh centuries B.C. But by this time I think we have learnt to read our history of Israel for the illustration of the Prophets of Israel, and perhaps the day has come for caution in the opposite direction. We must beware of trying to read references to a particular historical situation into a particular prophecy, where no such references exist. The Prophets (if I read them aright) were not moved by every eddy in the tide of events. They proclaimed great principles of the righteousness of God, and of the need men have of steadfast faith in Him, and they were not shaken in their presentation of these principles by the fall of a Judæan town or the overthrow of an Israelite army. They did not doubt that God fulfils Himself in many ways; Jerusalem might be held or surrendered, but Israel was still God's people, and His hand was still over them.

If we grasp this fact firmly, we shall not misunderstand the calmness and detachment from the Present which mark vers. 2-4. The Prophet has forgotten altogether the advance of the Assyrian devastator in the vision of the reign of the Messianic King. The seer looks *through the Present* as through glass, and sees the great final purposes of God working themselves out.

A HELP WHEN OTHERS FAIL, Vers. 5, 6.

And this man shall be our peace, when the Assyrian shall come into our land, and when he shall tread in our palaces, (and we shall have raised against him in vain seven shepherds, and eight princes of men, that they might waste the land of Assyria with the sword, and the land of Nimrod through her open gates,) then he shall deliver us from the Assyrian, even when he cometh into our land, and when he treadeth within our border.

I have slightly paraphrased this passage, which, as ordinarily translated, is all but impossible to understand. Dr. George Adam Smith (*XII. Prophets*, vol. i. pages 416-7) seems almost to give up the task as impracticable. He writes, "There follows upon this prophecy of the Shepherd a curious fragment which divides His office among a number of His order, though the grammar returns towards the end to One. The mention of Assyria stamps this oracle also as of the eighth century."

Now the main difficulty in the Hebrew arises from the well known poverty of the language in particles, i.e. adverbs and conjunctions. In the passage put in brackets above there is no conjunction used throughout but γ "and." The E.V. paraphrases the "and" in two places first by "when" and secondly by "then." In my own revised translation I have in the same two places used first "and" and secondly "that" (i.e. "in order that"). This paraphrasing of the conjunction "and" is not only permissible, but necessary; it is done many times on almost every page of the Old Testament in our translation: In fact the particular shade of meaning to be given to the Hebrew γ has to be fixed from the context. If the clauses follow one another in direct simple sequence of thought, we may translate by "and" following "and," until we are reminded, of the reiterated $\kappa\alpha\iota$ in the Epistle of St. John; but, on the other hand, if some clauses

stand in contrast to others, English conjunctions must be used in the translation which set forth the contrast.

Now the clauses bracketed in vers. 5, 6, certainly do stand in contrast with the clauses which precede and follow them. Notice, in the first place, a change of person in the verbs. Outside the bracket the discourse is of what one person, He, the Great Shepherd, will do; inside this unity is lost; the word is of what *we* do, and our seven or eight shepherds or princes. Within the bracket, again, the thought is of offensive, perhaps vainglorious war, whereas in the rest of the passage we are shown one who rises to deliver, when the Assyrian has already entered Judah. The contrast, I believe, is between fruitless human effort and Divine *fiat* executed without a struggle. I have therefore introduced the words *in vain* into the translation of verse 5.

In further justification of this gloss appeal may be made to two other points of language. The expression is "*we* have raised" or "*we* shall raise"; we may vary the tense in translating or paraphrasing the passage, but we cannot vary the person. Now if Micah were (as some think) speaking of a real deliverance granted to Israel by God by the hand of seven or eight great captains, is it possible for a moment to suppose that he, a prophet, would say "*we* raised up" these deliverers? It does not ring true. God alone gives Saviours.

Again, if the deliverers of Israel were spoken of as *seven*, we might with some reason think of *seven* as a number implying completion or perfection, and look upon the seven as true deliverers. But it is not so. It is *seven* shepherds, *eight* princes, i.e., to translate the Hebrew parallelism into plain dull prose, *seven* or *eight* leaders. This variation of number implies one of two things, *either* that leaders are raised up in succession, a new one as the old one falls, or that all is confusion, seven or eight different princes are

summoned, because no one of them is sufficient by himself to give confidence. *Seven* and *eight* then imply struggle, not victory. In homely English things are at *sixes and sevens*, as long as Judah seeks to deliver herself.

Once again, the expression *princes of men* (*nēsīchē ādām*) implies that these would-be deliverers are of no avail.¹ The words might be paraphrased *princes of flesh and blood*. The natural contrast to these princes is the Shepherd who *feeds his flock in the strength of the LORD*.

The force of verses 5, 6, then, is that the Deliverer from the Assyrian, when all other deliverers have failed, is to be a Prince of the House of David. This deliverance, however, in Micah's eyes is but one of the Prince's functions, a mere incident of His reign. The Reign in the strength of the LORD, the Dominion to the ends of the Earth is the real subject of Micah's vision.

A prince of the House of David, Hezekiah, did indeed, in some sense, guide his people through the Assyrian crisis, and under God deliver them from the complete destruction. But a true spiritual rule, such as Micah saw in vision, was not established on earth until the Messiah came. The Prophet speaks in fact with what has been called the prophetic foreshortening of the future. His eye is fixed on the distant glories which his God shows him, and he pays little heed to the measure of time which separates that Future from his own present. The reign of peace which he foresees is the reign of a prince yet to come of the house of David, and when he turns to the distress of the present with words of sympathy and comfort for his contemporaries he attributes even the near deliverance from Assyria to the prince of his vision. But God has more than one "Anointed King" (Messiah), and it

¹ I suspect that the kings of Egypt and of Philistia are meant; cf. Isaiah xxxi. 3, "Now the Egyptians are men (*ādām*), and not God." But the reference of *her open gates* may be to an attack on the rear of Assyria by Babylon and Elam.

was by a lesser hand that He saved Zion from the wrath of Sennacherib. But Hezekiah is no subject for a prophet to dwell on. The prophecy we are studying has indeed its historical connexion with events which happened seven centuries before Christ came, but its true subject is a universal spiritual kingdom, and that kingdom is the Kingdom of Christ.

W. EMERY BARNES.

LITERARY ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE BIBLE.

I. THE BOOK OF ECCLESIASTES.

i. 1 f. "There is an old Eastern fable about a traveller in the steppes who is attacked by a furious wild beast. To save himself the traveller gets into a dried-up well; but at the bottom of it he sees a dragon with its jaws wide open to devour him. The unhappy man dares not get out for fear of the wild beast, and dares not descend for fear of the dragon, so he catches hold of the branch of a wild plant growing in a crevice of the well. His arms soon grow tired, and he feels that he must soon perish, death waiting for him on either side. But he holds on still: and then he sees two mice, one black and one white, gnawing through the trunk of the wild plant, as they gradually and evenly make their way round it. The plant must soon give way, break off, and he must fall into the jaws of the dragon. The traveller sees this, and knows that he will inevitably perish; but, while still hanging on, he looks around him, and, finding some drops of honey on the leaves of the wild plant, he stretches out his tongue and licks them." After quoting this fable (translated, by the way, from Rückert, into English verse by Archbishop Trench, in his *Poems*, p. 266), Tolstoy (in *My Confession*) proceeds to apply it to modern life. He quotes the opening chapters

of Ecclesiastes as an expression of this Epicurean escape from the terrible plight in which people find themselves as they awaken to the fact of existence. The issue "consists in recognizing the hopelessness of life, and yet taking advantage of every good in it, in avoiding the sight of the dragon and mice, and in seeking the honey as best we can, especially where there is most of it. . . . Such is the way in which most people, who belong to the circle in which I move, reconcile themselves to their fate, and make living possible. They know more of the good than the evil of life from the circumstances of their position, and their blunted moral perceptions enable them to forget that all their advantages are accidental. . . . The dulness of their imaginations enables these men to forget what destroyed the peace of Buddha, the inevitable sickness, old age, and death, which to-morrow if not to-day must be the end of all their pleasures."

"In the case of a man belonging to another nature and another race, we might endeavour to conceive Paul in those latter days of his life as one who at last recognized he had spent his life for a dream, as one who repudiated all the holy prophets for a work which till then he had hardly read, viz. Ecclesiastes (a book instinct with charm, the one really loveable book ever written by a Jew), declaring the truly happy man to be he who, having lived his life joyfully to old age with the wife of his youth, dies without having lost his sons. It is characteristic of great Europeans to justify Epicurus at certain moments, to be seized with nausea amid their arduous toils, and even after succeeding in their efforts to begin to wonder whether, after all, the cause which they have served was worth such sacrifices. . . . We could wish that Paul had sometimes, like ourselves, sat down wearied by the wayside, and perceived how vain are fixed beliefs" (Renan's *L'Antéchrist*, pp. 101, 102).

“Ecclesiastes and Proverbs display a larger compass of thought and of experience than seem to belong to a Jew or to a king” (Gibbon).

“After the fifth century the world lived on these words : *Vanity of vanities . . . one thing is needful*. The *Imitatio Christi* is undoubtedly the most perfect and attractive expression of this great poetic system ; but a modern mind cannot accept it save with considerable reserve. Mysticism overlooked that innate quality of human nature, curiosity, which makes men penetrate the secret of things, and become, as Leibnitz says, the mirror of the universe. . . . Ecclesiastes took the heavens to be a solid roof, and the sun a globe suspended some miles up in the air ; history, that other world, had no existence for him. Ecclesiastes, I am willing to believe, had felt all that man’s heart could feel ; but he had no suspicion of what man is allowed to know. The human mind in his day overpowered science ; in our day it is science that overpowers the human mind” (Renan).

i. 2, 8. See *Imitatio Christi*, i. 1.

i. 9. “We marvel at the prodigality of Nature, but how marvellous, too, the economy ! The old cycles are for ever renewed, and it is no paradox that he who would advance can never cling too close to the past. The thing that has been is the thing that will be again ; if we realize that, we may avoid many of the disillusionings, miseries, insanities, that for ever accompany the throes of new birth. Set your shoulder joyously to the world’s wheel ; you may spare yourself some unhappiness if, beforehand, you slip the Book of *Ecclesiastes* beneath your arm” (Havelock Ellis). Cf. Jowett’s *Sermons on Faith and Doctrine*, pp. 282–283.

i. 11. *I was king in Jerusalem*. “The possession of a throne could never yet afford a lasting satisfaction to an ambitious mind. This melancholy truth was felt and acknowledged by Severus. Fortune and merit had, from

an humble station, elevated him to the first place among mankind. 'He had been all things,' as he said himself, 'and all were of little value'" (Gibbon, ch. ii.).

i. 8, ii. 10-11, etc. "When I was a boy, I used to care about pretty stones. I got some Bristol diamonds at Bristol, and some dog-tooth spar in Derbyshire; my whole collection had cost perhaps three half-crowns, and was worth considerably less; and I knew nothing whatever, rightly, about any single stone in it—could not even spell their names; but words cannot tell the joy they used to give me. Now, I have a collection of minerals worth, perhaps, from two to three thousand pounds; and I know more about some of them than most other people. But I am not a whit happier, either for my knowledge or possessions, for other geologists dispute my theories, to my grievous indignation and discontentment; and I am miserable about all my best specimens, because there are better in the British Museum. No, I assure you, knowledge by itself will not make you happy" (Ruskin in *Fors Clavigera*). See also the discussion of this in Bacon's *Advancement of Learning*, I. i.-iii., and Ruskin's further apostrophe in *The Eagle's Nest*, 80.—"I began expounding, in order, the Book of Ecclesiastes. I never before had so clear a sight either of the meaning or the beauties of it. Neither did I imagine that the several parts of it were in so exquisite a manner connected together; all tending to prove that grand truth—that there is no happiness out of God" (*Wesley's Journal*, 1777).

i. 12 f.

"A king dwelt in Jerusalem;
He was the wisest man on earth;
He had all riches from his birth,
And pleasures till he tired of them;
Then, having tasted all things, he
Witnessed that all are vanity."

(C. G. Rossetti: see the whole poem, "A Testimony";

also her verses on "Vanity of Vanities," "Days of Vanity," "Cardinal Newman," and "The Heart knoweth its own Bitterness.")

"A word must be said about those exquisite gems of verse which are contained in the *Greek Anthology*. . . . The motto which is written on the pages as a whole is the same as that of the Book of Ecclesiastes, "Vanity of vanities," *ματαιότης ματαιοτήτων*, and the dominant side of sadness deepens the farther we follow the poems into Roman times. Herodotus (v. 4) tells us of a Thracian tribe, whose custom it was to wail over the birth of a child, and to bury the dead with festive joy, as being released from their troubles. 'Let us praise the Thracians,' says a writer in the *Anthology*, 'in that they mourn for their sons as they come forth from their mother's womb into the sunlight, while those again they count blessed who have left life, snatched away by unseen Doom, the servant of the Fates.' One who had looked upon the course of the world and the treacherous ways of fortune is forced to exclaim: 'I hate the world for its mystery'" (S. H. Butcher).

i. 14. "Nature has furnished man with a rich provision of force, activity, and toughness. But what most often comes to his help is his unconquerable levity. By this he becomes capable of renouncing particular things at each moment, if he can only grasp at something new in the next. Then unconsciously we are constantly renewing our whole lives. We put one passion in place of another; business, inclinations, amusements, hobbies, we prove them all one after another, only to cry out that 'all is vanity.' No one is shocked at this false, nay, blasphemous speech. Nay, every one thinks that in uttering it he has said something wise and unanswerable. Few indeed are those who are strong enough to anticipate such unbearable feelings, and, in order to escape from all partial renuncia-

tions, to perform one all-embracing act of renunciation. These are the men who convince themselves of the existence of the eternal, of the necessary, of the universal, and who seek to form conceptions which cannot fail them, yea, which are not disturbed, but rather confirmed, by the contemplation of that which passes away" (Goethe).

i. 17. See Mozley's *Parochial and Occasional Sermons* (number xvi.).

ii. 11. "He rushed through life. . . . He desired too much; he wished strongly and greedily to taste life in one draught, thoroughly; he did not glean or taste it, he tore it off like a bunch of grapes, pressing it, crushing it, twisting it; and he remains with stained hands, just as thirsty as before. Then broke forth sobs which found an echo in all hearts" (Taine, on Alfred de Musset).

ii. 4-6, 8, 11. "If any resemblance with Tennyson's poetry is to be found in Ecclesiastes, it should be with the Palace of Art" (Sir Alfred Lyall). See Byron's *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage*, canto i. iv.-vi., for a description of the dull satiety that follows self-indulgence.

ii. 17. See Quarles' *Emblems*, Bk. i. 6, and the *Religio Medici*, ii. § xiv. (close).

ii. 22 f. "What a deal of cold business doth a man mispend the better part of life in! in scattering compliments, tendering visits, gathering and venting news, following feasts and plays, making a little winter-love in a dark corner" (Ben Jonson).

iii. 2. "A time to plant, and a time to pluck up that which is planted." "The second of these may describe the times of analysis which often succeed periods of creation. They are not necessarily bad, for they may detect things evil and hollow; but they are times of distrust and unsettlement, and they easily go to excess. Everything is doubted, and in some minds this leads to universal scepticism. We are in such a period now, and it gives the feel-

ing as if the ages of faith were past, and bare rationalism lord of the future. This would resolve everything into dust and death.”¹ (Dr. John Ker’s *Thoughts for Heart and Life*, p. 153.)

iii. 4. *There is a time . . . to laugh.* “Men thin away to insignificance quite as often by not making the most of good spirits when they have them as by lacking good spirits when they are indispensable” (Thomas Hardy).

iii. 8. *There is a time . . . to hate.* “Ah, Sam!” said Carlyle once to Froude, *apropos* of Bishop Wilberforce, “he is a very clever fellow; I do not hate him near as much as I fear I ought to do.” Compare Newman’s lines on *Zeal and Love*.

iii. 11. “What we mean to insist upon is, that in finding out the works of God, the intellect must labour, workman-like, under the direction of the architect—Imagination. . . . ‘He hath set the world in man’s heart,’ not in his understanding, and the heart must open the door to the understanding. It is the far-seeing imagination which beholds what might be a form of things, and says to the intellect, ‘Try whether that may not be the form of these things.’” So George Macdonald writes in his essay on *The Imagination*, which he concludes by quoting Ecclesiastes iii. 10, 11 over again as “setting forth both the necessity we are under to imagine, and the comfort that our imagining cannot outstrip God’s making.” “Thus,” he comments, “thus to be playfellows with God in this game, the little ones may gather their daisies and follow their painted moths; the child of the kingdom may pore upon the lilies of the field, and gather faith as the birds of the air their food from the leafless hawthorn, ruddy with the stores God has laid up for them; and the man of science

¹ See J. S. Mill’s *Autobiography*, p. 137, for a description of its working on himself.

“May sit and rightly spell
Of every star that heaven doth shew,
And every herb that sips the dew;
Till old experience do attain
To something like prophetic strain.”

iii. 11. “The tree of life is always in bloom somewhere, if we only know where to look” (Havelock Ellis).

iv. 1, 2. Cf. John Morley’s *Critical Miscellanies*, i. pp. 84 f.

iv. 8. See Quarles’ *Emblems*, ii. 2.

iv. 9.

“The help in strife,
The thousand sweet, still joys of such
As hand in hand face earthly life.”

(M. Arnold.)

“*Hopeful*. I acknowledge myself in a fault, and had I been here alone, I had by sleeping run the danger of death. I see it is true that the wise man saith, *Two are better than one*. Hitherto hath thy company been my mercy” (Bunyan).

iv. 10. “I drown the past in still hoping for the future, but God knows whether futurity will be as great a cheat as ever. I sometimes think it will. I tell you candidly, I am sometimes out of spirits, and have need of *co-operation*, or Heaven knows yet what will become of my fine castles in the air. So you must bring *spirits, spirits, spirits*” (Cobden to his brother).

iv. 12. “We are three people, but only one soul,” said Coleridge, speaking of Wordsworth, Dorothy Wordsworth, and himself.

v. 2 f. “To bind myself to diligence in seeking the Lord, and to stir me up thereto, I made a vow to pray so many times a day; how many times I cannot be positive; but it was at least thrice. It was the goodness of God to me, that it was made only for a definite space of time; but I found it so far from being a help, that it was really a

hindrance to my devotion, making me more heartless in, and averse to, duty, through the corruption of my nature. I got the time of it driven out accordingly; but I never durst make another of that nature since, nor so bind up myself, where God had left me at liberty" (Thomas Boston).

"Do not accustom yourself to enchain your volatility with vows; they will sometimes leave a thorn in your mind, which you will, perhaps, never be able to extract or eject. Take this warning; it is of great importance" (Johnson to Boswell).

Let thy words be few. "What people call fluency, and the gift of prayer, is often delusive; it is mere excitement from the presence of others, and from the sound of our own voice" (F. W. Robertson).—"There is no need to say much to God. One often does not talk much to a friend whom one is delighted to see; one enjoys looking at him, and one says some few words which are purely matter of feeling. One does not so much seek interchange of thought as rest and communion of heart with one's friend. Even so it should be with God—a word, a sigh, a thought, a feeling, says everything" (Fénelon).

v. 8. In describing the need for the reforms of Caesar under the new monarchy, Mommsen (*History of Rome*, bk. v. chap. xi.) declares that "the most incurable wounds were inflicted on justice by the doings of the advocates. In proportion as the parasitic plant of Roman forensic eloquence flourished, all positive ideas of right became broken up. . . . A plain, simple defendant, says a Roman advocate of much experience at this period, may be accused of any crime at pleasure which he has, or has not, committed, and will be certainly condemned."

"For a tear is an intellectual thing,
And a sigh is the sword of an Angel king,
And the bitter groan of a martyr's woe
Is an arrow from the Almighty's bow." (Blake.)

“Time’s glory is to calm contending kings,
To unmask falsehood and bring truth to light,
To wrong the wronger till he render right.”

(Shakspeare.)

See Lowell’s poem, *Villa Franca*. “The repugnance of man to injustice is with him an early and favourite topic of proof” (Gladstone on Butler).

v. 10. See Ruskin’s *On the Old Road* (ii. § 162) for a comment on “a lover of silver.”

v. 12a.

“When the last dawns are fallen on gray,
And all life’s toils and ease complete,
They know who work, not they who play,
If rest is sweet.” (J. A. Symonds.)

v. 13 f. “To acquire interest on money, and to acquire interest in life are *not* the same thing” (Edward Carpenter).

vi. 8, 9.

“One breast laid open were a school,
Which would unteach mankind the lust to strive or rule.”

(Byron.)

vi. 9. W. Morris, on the cravings spired by the ocean:—

“Yea, whoso sees thee from his door,
Must ever long for more and more;
Nor will the beechen bowl suffice,
Or homespun robe of little price,
Or hood well-woven of the fleece
Undyed, or unsiced wine of Greece;
So sore his heart is set upon
Purple and gold and cinnamon;
For as thou cravest, so he craves,
Until he rolls beneath thy waves.”

vii. 2 f. “We are apt to blame society for being constrained and artificial, but its conventionalities are only the result of the limitations of man’s own nature. How much, for instance, of what is called ‘reserve’ belongs to this life, and passes away with its waning, and the waxing

of the new life! We can say to the dying, and hear from them, things that, in the fulness of health and vigour, could not be imparted without violence to some inward instinct. And this is one reason, among many others, why it is so *good* to be in the house of mourning, the chamber of death. It is there more easy to be *natural*,—to be true, I mean, to that which is deepest within us. Is there not something in the daily familiar course of life, which seems in a strange way to veil its true aspect? It is not Death, but Life, which wraps us about with shroud and cerement" (Dora Greenwell, *Two Friends*, pp. 38, 39). Compare Sterne's famous sermon on this text ("So strange and unaccountable a creature is man! He is so framed that he cannot but pursue happiness, and yet, unless he is made sometimes miserable, how apt he is to mistake the way which can only lead him to the accomplishment of his own wishes," etc.).

vii. 2 f. "Every one observes how temperate and reasonable men are when humbled and brought low by afflictions, in comparison of what they are in high prosperity. By this voluntary resort unto the house of mourning, which is here recommended, we might learn all these useful instructions which calamities teach, without undergoing them ourselves, and grow wiser and better at a more easy rate than men commonly do. . . . This would correct the florid and gaudy prospects and expectations which we are too apt to indulge, teach us to lower our notions of happiness and enjoyment, bring them down to the reality of things, to what is attainable" (Bishop Butler).

"Dark is the realm of grief: but human things
Those may not know who cannot weep for them."

(Shelley.)

vii. 5. "It is the sinful unhappiness of some men's minds that they usually disaffect those that cross them in

their corrupt proceedings, and plainly tell them of their faults. They are ready to judge of the reprover's spirit by their own, and to think that all such sharp reproof proceed from some disaffection to their persons, or partial opposition to the opinions which they hold. But plain dealers are always approved in the end, and the time is at hand when you shall confess these were your truest friends" (Richard Baxter, preface to the *Reformed Pastor*).

"A truth told us is harder to bear than a hundred which we tell ourselves" (Fénelon).

vii. 6.

"I think the immortal servants of mankind,
 Who, from their graves, watch by how slow degrees
 The world-soul greatens with the centuries,
 Mourn most man's barren levity of mind,
 The ear to no grave harmonies inclined,
 The witless thirst for false wit's worthless lees,
 The laugh mistimed in tragic presences,
 The eye to all majestic meanings blind."

(William Watson.)

"During that time" (his agitation on behalf of Calas' descendants) "not a smile escaped me without my reproaching myself for it, as for a crime" (Voltaire).

"Froude," said Keble once to Hurrell Froude, "you said you thought Law's *Serious Call* was a clever book; it seemed to me as if you had said the Day of Judgment will be a pretty sight."

"Prithee weep, May Lilian!
 Gaiety without eclipse
 Wearieth me, May Lilian!"

(Tennyson.)

vii. 8, 9. "There is not a greater foe to spirituality than wrath; and wrath even in a righteous cause distempers the heart" (Chalmers).

vii. 10. "An obsolete discipline may be a present

heresy" (Newman). See also Ben Jonson's *Discoveries*, §§ xxi., cxxiii. :—

"I count him wise,
Who loves so well man's noble memories,
He needs must love man's nobler hopes yet more."
(W. Watson.)

"But for the new world and its ways,
And all the great hopes of the latter days,
Their science and its expanding views,
New-fangled craving for latest news,
And workmen striking for higher wage,
And all that mostly our thoughts engage—
For them he kept strictly a yearly Fast,
Each year bitterer than the last—
It fell when Culloden's day begins,
And he called it the Fast of all the Sins."
(W. C. Smith.)

Carlyle, said Maurice once, believes in a God who lived till the death of Oliver Cromwell. See Spenser's sonnet on Scanderberg.

"We shall not acknowledge that old stars fade or alien planets
arise,
That the sere bush buds or the desert blooms or the ancient well-
head dries,
Or any new compass wherewith new men adventure 'neath new
skies."
(Kipling.)

"Both in politics and in art Plato seems to have seen no way of bringing order out of disorder, except by taking a step backwards. Antiquity, compared with the world in which he lived, had a sacredness and authority for him; the men of a former age were supposed by him to have had a sense of reverence which was wanting among his contemporaries" (Jowett).

JAMES MOFFATT.

(To be continued.)

*THE HISTORICAL CHARACTER OF JESUS OF
NAZARETH.*

WHEN in the middle of the nineteenth century D. F. Strauss reduced the bulk of the Gospel narratives to myth, it was not his intention to deprive them of all their historical character ; and, indeed, in the later edition of his famous work, which he intended to be popular, he devoted a considerable section to a historical sketch of the life of Jesus. Since the mythical history occupies in his book only twice the number of pages which are devoted to the historical sketch, it is clear that he was far from thinking the subject of his sketch a creature of the fancy ; and his view is shared by many English writers who even employ some of the Gospel narratives as evidence against the others : besides condemning a number on the ground of the miracles which they involve, they condemn others as unsuitable to the character which in other portions of the Gospels they believe to be faithfully depicted. Recent discussions in the newspapers have shown that distinguished Anglican theologians are embracing this opinion. They abandon (let us say) the doctrines of the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection, but retain a general belief in the veracity of the Gospels.

There is, however, a step beyond this, a yet more radical form of criticism than that of Strauss. This is to deprive the Gospels of all claim to be regarded as history, by denying that such a person as Jesus of Nazareth ever existed. Such a view is not yet popular ; though suggested as early

as 1863, it has found few supporters outside the Rationalist Press Association, a body of writers whose works are characterized by violent hostility to Christianity, such as perverts their judgment in estimating evidence; nor, indeed, are all the authors in this series agreed on this question, since several take a view which more nearly resembles that of Strauss. The chief exponent of this ultra-radicalism is Mr. J. M. Robertson, who has given his views in a number of works—*Studies in Religious Fallacy* (1900), *Christianity and Mythology* (1900), *A Short History of Christianity* (1902), *Pagan Christs* (1903). Since the paradox of one generation is the commonplace of the next—as, indeed, is clearly shown by the approximation of current theology to the once tabooed opinions of Strauss—it is worth while endeavouring to form an opinion as to the probability of the view propounded by Robertson acquiring permanent popularity.

In the first place, it is clear that the Gospel narrative is located within historic times: a fact which distinguishes it at once from the tales of Krishna, Zoroaster, etc., with which it is brought into comparison. For Palestine itself there is some contemporary history; for the empire of which Palestine formed a part there is much. But yet the main events recorded in the Gospels are of a sort which would be unlikely to find a place in contemporary history, though their memory would be cherished by the circle whom they interested. The execution of a Reformer who had only a small following, and who attempted no armed resistance to established authority, would have but a moderate chance of being recorded in the local chronicle, none at all of being recorded in the imperial history. When, therefore, the Gospels, in any case within 150 years of the supposed time, record the execution of Jesus of Nazareth by a governor who is a historical personage, and that execution is commemorated by a community which

cannot be traced earlier than the event, it is difficult to see why the event should not be historical.

It is at the point of the Crucifixion that the Gospel narrative comes in contact with profane history, and though not mentioned by contemporary historians, it is mentioned by a pagan historian—Tacitus—so soon as its effects made themselves felt at the Capital. The notion that the Annals of Tacitus are spurious has not hitherto gained a sufficient number of adherents to permit of his evidence being discounted. But even if he be disregarded, the evidence of the Gospels, which, while knowing the name of few Roman Governors, unanimously bring this event into connexion with Pilate, cannot easily be rejected. Nor does the hypothesis that the Gospel narratives are derived from a miracle-play weaken their evidence. The death of Husain at Kerbela is similarly commemorated by a miracle-play, yet no one doubts that Husain is a historical character.

The question of the existence of the Gospels at any period before the latest at which their existence is not denied appears to be of no importance for this matter. For that the Gospels are not varying recensions of a romance is evident: the first three are very clearly redactions of an oral tradition. That oral tradition may contain numerous accretions; but that there may be accretions there must be something whereto they can cling.

Indeed, this is recognized by Mr. Robertson, who finds the nucleus of the Gospel story in one "Jesus, son of Pandira, mentioned in the Talmud, as hanged on a tree and stoned to death at Lydda, in the reign of Alexander Jannaeus." The Talmud, however, is "Oral Tradition," as its very name, "the Oral Law," implies; written down, according to the classical commentator, Rashi, "near his own time," i.e., about the ninth century A.D.; according to no opinion earlier than the fifth century A.D. Why, then, should the oral tradition of the Jews on this subject be

preferred to the oral tradition of the Christians, when the former was committed to writing some three centuries later than the latter, and when the sect that followed Christ are (in accordance with all analogy) likely to know most about Him?

This story of Jesus, son of Pandira, was indeed known to Celsus (A.D. 190), and its cropping up in the oral tradition of the Jews is curious evidence of the tenacity of oral tradition. The details of Lydda and Alexander Jannaeus are due to the fancy of the Rabbis, and are not of course worth a moment's consideration; whereas the combination of hanging and stoning is an interesting case of conflation of traditions. The name Pandira has given trouble, and been used as the basis of extraordinary conjectures by Haeckel and others. Another form is Pantra; since the name *Peter* takes in some Arabic works the form Batirah, we need have no hesitation in identifying this Talmudic Pandira with the familiar Peter (Petros) of the Gospels. The acquaintance with the Gospel narrative shown in making Jesus the son of Peter is similar to that which is displayed in making the mother of Jesus "Mary the plaiter of hair" (Megadla, a clear mistranslation of the form Magdalene). Somewhat similarly a later Rabbi makes Paul the father of Saul.¹ Similarly Mohammed regarded Mary the Virgin as the same as Mary or Miriam the sister of Moses. This last doctrine appears to have found a patron (at last, after 1,300 years!) in Mr. Robertson; but his acceptance of it suggests that he is inclined to paradox. The fact is that such matters as relationships and synchronisms are better known to friends than to enemies, to kindred than to strangers. Hence for the date and attribution of the Founder of Christianity, as indeed of the founder of Islam and the founder of Mormonism, it is far safer to go to the adherents than to enemies of these systems.

¹ Jepheth Ibn Ali, *Comm. on Daniel*.

Certainly, Mr. Robertson is not altogether satisfied with "Jesus, son of Pandira," and endeavours to find traces elsewhere of the association of the name Jesus with Messianic hopes. One such trace he would find in the Joshua or Joshua to whom history or myth ascribes the final conquest and settlement of Canaan. Another in the Jesus, son of Josedek, whose name is associated with the rebuilding of the Temple. Both these suggestions are desperate in character. For, however mythical may be the Joshua who succeeded Moses, for some four centuries or more B.C. he was regarded as a historical character, as appears from the book of Nehemiah; but of any doctrine of his future re-appearance there is no trace: the prophet whose re-appearance was expected was Elijah, as we learn from Ben-Sira. Jesus, the son of Josedek, is certainly said in Zechariah vi. 12 to have had the second name Semach, or "branch," but of him we learn from Ben-Sira that his memory was honoured as one of the rebuilders of the Temple—no other hopes being associated with him.

Indeed, the evidence of the Gospels points with certainty to the fact that the name Jeshua or Jesus was not in itself associated with any Messianic prophecies, for no text of the Old Testament is quoted in justification of the name. On the other hand, the Old Testament supplies many names which exegesis appears to have connected with the Messiah from very early times—Shiloh, Emmanuel, David. Round one of these myth must necessarily have gathered, if the Messiah had been mythical. That the name borne by the Christian Messiah is none of these clearly proves that we have to do not with myth but history.

Then, the home of Jesus is given in the Gospels as Nazareth, a place also not foretold in the Old Testament, and not otherwise famous. The first Evangelist quotes a prophecy, "He shall be called Nazoraios," which he interprets of the home in Nazareth, but it is unknown to what

text he refers. Hence he has been accused of deliberately inventing a prophecy, but it is more likely that accident, not design, has produced this difficulty. It is certainly a curious perversion of the ordinary view, by which Mr. Robertson supposes the connexion of the Messiah with Nazareth to have arisen from the text which is sometimes thought to underlie St. Matthew's quotation—Isaiah xi. 1—where a word *neṣer*, “branch,” seems to be used with Messianic import. The process then imagined is that a Messianic sect were called the Nasrites, or Branchists, falsely interpreted at a later time as followers of a man of Nazareth. Ingenious as this conjecture is, some positive evidence of the existence of a sect of Branchists would have to be adduced before any probability could be assigned it.

Otherwise the objections brought to the ordinary interpretation seem to be inconsiderable. The Syriac for “of Nazareth” is *Nāṣrayyā*, or *Noṣrayyo*; that the Greek *Nazoraïos* is a fair transliteration of this must be conceded; the other form *Nazarenos* merely differs from it in having the Greek termination instead of the Syriac. That “by no possibility could a sect be called Nazarenes whose founder never taught in Nazareth” is asserted by Mr. Robertson, but this proposition cannot be accepted. The Druses or Darazis are called after a certain Mohammed Ibn Isma'il al-Darazi, “the Tailor”; the Jubba' is after a man called al-Jubba'i, or “native of Jubba'.” Just as with us a man is known by his Christian name to his family, but outside it by his surname, so among the Easterns a man must, besides his actual name, have some more distinctive appellation, rendered especially necessary where the same name is constantly employed. Hence the greater number of Arabic authors are known not by their names but by the place whence they came—Bokhari, Tirmidhi, Nasa'i, Kazwini, Hamdani, Khwarizmi. Secondary relative adjectives are formed neither in Hebrew nor

Arabic, whence the followers of a Bokhari would be called Bokharis. The question of the length of time spent at Bokhara by Bokhari would not enter into the heads of those who called the followers of such a man Bokharis. That the name Jesus was 'exceedingly common among the Jews, till the rise of Christianity made them detest it, we know from the later books of the Old Testament. Hence the old explanation of Nazarenes or Nazoraioi as followers of the Man of Nazareth is perfectly natural and simple.

In *Studies in Religious Fallacy* the question of the names Nazoraioi and Nazarene (pp. 154-6) is discussed at length, but the statements on which the results are based appear to be quite indefensible. It is asserted that Nazoraioi means Nazarite, i.e., an ascetic of the sort familiar from the Old Testament; but the form used by the LXX. and Josephus is Nazaraioi or Naziraioi, where the Hebrew is not transliterated as Nazir¹; the variety between the vowels *a* and *i* is accounted for by a grammatical rule, but a form Nazoraioi is not found representing Nazir, nor is there any reason why it should be. "And that Nazarite was the originally current form in the East appears from the Syrian Peshito, which only at Matthew ii. 23 gives an adjective based on the place-name, Nazareth, and everywhere else gives the equivalent of Nazoraioi save in Luke iv. 34, where it recurs to a variant of the geographical adjective, and in John i. 45 and Acts x. 38." One would gladly know whence this statement comes, for no one who had consulted the Peshito could have made it. The "adjective based on the place-name," which occurs in Matthew ii. 23, occurs (practically) wherever the Greek Nazoraioi, or Nazarenos, occurs; and there is no place in the New Testament where the Syriac word for Nazarite is found. Any one who is acquainted with the Syriac alphabet is aware that the word for Nazarite is written with *z*, that for Nazarene with an em-

¹ See the Concordances of Hatch and Bruder.

phatic *s*, whence confusion between the two is impossible. Still, Mr. Robertson must have got this statement from somewhere, but it is wholly inaccurate none the less.

The connexion of the mythical Jesus with the mythical Nazareth, as Mr. Robertson explains it, seems far less felicitous than his conjecture about the Branchists. He observes that Jesus, son of Josedek, is in the text quoted from Zechariah described as the Branch. This is so, but the word for Branch used here is not *Neşer*, but *Şemach*, and that the Prophet means the latter only is shown by his playing on it, the word in the following clause rendered "grow" being of the same radicals. On the word *neşer* it would be possible to play also, but the resulting sense would be quite different. Hence the conjecture by which this text is made to explain the connexion between the Christian Jesus and Nazareth has no probability.

Nazareth, moreover, by no means stands alone in the Gospel narrative, which records a number of events connected with Galilee and places otherwise of no consequence in that portion of Palestine. That all these occasions are historical need not be asserted. But even if they be supposed to consist largely of myth, they can only be accounted for on the supposition that the nucleus of history round which they grew was connected with Galilee; and while those of them that are historical confirm the connexion of the Founder of Christianity with Nazareth, those taken as mythical also assume it.

In the Fourth Gospel (vii. 27) the Jews object that they know whence Jesus came, whereas the home of the real Christ should be unknown. This implies that the connexion not only with Nazareth, but also with Joseph and Mary, was generally acknowledged. Like Nazareth, both these latter names are reduced to myth by the new criticism. With regard to Mary, it is observed that many names of goddesses either begin with the letter *M* or bear some

resemblance to the word Mary—e.g., the Indian Maya, “delusion.” The Arabic historian Tabari (of the tenth century A.D.) is quoted for a tradition that Joshua’s mother was named Mary. We should, indeed, have to re-write Biblical history if any importance were attached to Tabari’s statements on the subject; it is sufficient to mention that, according to him, it was generally agreed that Joshua was succeeded by Caleb, then by Ezekiel!

Worthless, however, as would be the statement of Tabari if he made it, he does not make it. The original of his Chronicle has been edited at Leyden by the best Arabic scholars in Europe; and his words run as follows (vol. i., page 508, line 7): “When there ended the forty years in which they were made to wander, Moses proceeded with them, having with him Joshua, son of Nun, and Caleb, son of Jephunneh, and he was, according to what they assert, the husband of Miriam, daughter of ‘Imran, sister of Moses and Aaron, and so was their brother-in-law.” The words, of course, mean that Caleb (not Joshua) was not the *son*, but the *husband* of Miriam; and Ibn al-Athir, who copies Tabari, makes this additionally clear (Cairo ed. i. 69). This Semitic tradition, which the Bible-makers concealed, turns out, then, to be a mistake or addition of the Persian translator of Tabari—of a sort against which the French translator specially warns us. And on this curious foundation there is based the suggestion (*Short History of Christianity*, p. 15), “as Joshua is in Arab tradition the son of the mythic Miriam (Mary), it may be that the roots of the historic Christian cult go back to an immemorial Semitic antiquity, when already the name of Jesus was divine.” Substituting correct premisses for those employed, we get the following argument: since there was a tradition current in the tenth century A.D. that Caleb was the husband of Miriam, it may be that the cult of a Jesus, son of Mary, goes back to immemorial antiquity. This suggests a curious study in *Religious Fallacies*.

With regard to the name Joseph, the Rabbinic tradition of a Messiah Ben Joseph is naturally quoted to account for it. Certainly some Talmudic passages can be adduced which speak of a suffering Messiah, son of Joseph, as opposed to the conquering Messiah, son of David. Evidence, however, of such a doctrine having existed in pre-Christian times should be brought, before it could be freed from the suspicion of having arisen under the influence of Christian theology. In the Gospels the idea of a suffering Messiah is represented as an afterthought, a notion recognized after the fulfilment, but by no means understood before. The event of the Crucifixion led to reflexion on the prophecies which were then found to contain such a conception. The Rabbis in the New Testament, in answer to the question, Whose son is Christ? reply unhesitatingly, the Son of David; to those who record that scene the notion of a Messiah, son of Joseph, expected by the Rabbis is quite unfamiliar. But the idea of a suffering Messiah, first developed in Christian circles, is likely to have spread outside them. Hence the Rabbinic "Messiah, son of Joseph," so far from giving an explanation of the ascription of Jesus to a father named Joseph probably owes his existence to that ascription.

With regard to external evidence, in 1900 Mr. Robertson apparently believed in the genuineness of some of the Pauline Epistles, and collected eight matters (e.g., the story of Judas Iscariot and Peter's denial) which are mentioned in the Gospels, to which St. Paul makes no allusion. How far this list can be trusted ought not, perhaps, to be guessed from the first item, "He has no single allusion to the parents of Jesus"; for since at the very beginning of St. Paul's first Epistle in the ordinary order (Rom. i. 3) Jesus Christ is said to have been born of the seed of David according to the flesh—a very distinct allusion to the parents of Jesus—the list by no means inspires confidence.

But even if it were trustworthy, the argument drawn from it would be liable to the difficulties which regularly attend the argument from silence ; for we none of us when writing mention everything that we know. There are doubtless cases in which silence implies ignorance or ignoring ; but before we could argue from St. Paul's Epistles that their author can never have heard of the Betrayal by Judas or of the Denial by Peter, it would have to be shown that there were places which imperatively called for their mention. In his latest works, however, Mr. Robertson has adopted the extraordinary view of the Epistles propounded by Van Manen, who regards them all as spurious ; but he fails to draw the inference that the evidence of spurious Epistles would not be worth having.

With regard to the correspondence of Christian practice and Christian doctrine with Pagan ceremonies and beliefs, the works cited certainly contain interesting collections of facts, which it is to be hoped may be trustworthy. And so far as such collections lead to sympathy with, and a better understanding of, alien cults, both the subject chosen and perhaps the manner of handling it often deserve commendation. If the inclusion of certain theories and rites rendered Christianity palatable to those who adopted it, we at least learn something as to men's spiritual needs, and the clothes which are found most seemly for spiritual conceptions. But when it is argued that an event is not historical because something similar figures in the mythology of another community, the reasoning appears to be very unsafe. That the doctrine of the death and resurrection of Adonis satisfied a need afterwards satisfied by the belief in the death and resurrection of Jesus may be admitted ; but the fact can surely have no bearing whatever on the historical character of either the Crucifixion or the Resurrection as the Gospels narrate them ; and should the latter be disbelieved on philosophical grounds, the story of the

former remains unaffected even by them. It is rather remarkable that the author of works professedly dealing with Logic (*Letters on Reasoning* and *Studies in Religious Fallacy*) should give some ground for the suspicion that he has been himself led away by a fallacy.

To the present writer, then, it seems that the advance beyond Strauss is likely to lead to a retrogressive movement. But to what point that retreat will be carried the future must show.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

*DOGMATIC THEOLOGY: ITS NATURE AND
FUNCTION.*¹

THE unambitious task we shall essay this morning is to gain a precise and comprehensive notion of the subject on which the class of Dogmatic Theology is to be engaged. In one sense, of course, this is impossible at the outset. A great philosopher has said that clear self-consciousness is the last result of action. It is not the man who is in the middle of doing a thing that knows the meaning of what he is doing, but the man who has come to the end, and looks back. The dictum is as true of sciences or of theories as of the history of a nation or a Church. At the outset, that is, you cannot condense a treatise into a phrase and call it a definition, nor would it, if you could, be of the least use to those who wish to begin at the beginning, and to form their conceptions of the science in question as they proceed. At the same time something of practical value may be done in the way of description, if not of definition strictly understood; and obviously to secure a working idea of the subject-matter of Dogmatics as well as of the methods proper for its treatment, whether it yields much positive enlightenment or not, may prove of considerable benefit in preserving us from erroneous prepossessions.

To diverge into history for the moment, it is a not unimportant detail that Systematic Theology, in its older signification, embraced what we are accustomed to regard as three distinct theological disciplines—distinct, that is, in treatment, but not really separate in fact. These were Apologetics, Dogmatics, and Ethics; the last having commonly attached to it the epithet “Christian” or “Theological,” to mark the difference that obtains between it and the more general science of Philosophical Ethics, or

¹ Inaugural Lecture to the Class of Systematic Theology, New College, Edinburgh, Oct. 20, 1904.

the Theory of Morals. Men were quite aware, of course, that these three members of the organism of Systematic are in the closest possible connexion. They all deal with Christianity as a definite truth or power at work in human life, viewed in each case, however, from a slightly different angle. You may say, for example, as Kähler does, that all three are concerned with justifying faith in Christ; Apologetics taking as its province the grounds of faith, Dogmatics its import, and Ethics its practical expression in life. Or in simpler English, you may say that they deal respectively with the presuppositions, the content, and the practical issues of saving faith. In either case, their common interest in understanding what the Christian faith is and implies signalizes the truth, not only that they are distinct, but that they are *related*, which here and everywhere else is very far the more important fact of the two. It is, then, with the second of these kindred, and, in a sense, co-ordinate studies, that we in this class are concerned.

Now in the general title of this department of theology, there occurs a very significant adjective—Systematic. That tells and foretells not a little. It means that we are at work upon a subject which is a whole—not a collection of alien fragments of knowledge, not a combination of interesting but inconsecutive ideas, but a whole. If Christianity is really one—and this is certain if Christ is one—theology, which is a sustained attempt to exhibit Christianity to a believing mind which is also a knowing mind, is a unity too. Every part of it is in vital connexion with every other part. We speak of the Caledonian Railway system, and by that phrase we mean that we can get from any one point to any other without hiatus or break. In the same way, if theology be the outcome of an effort to present the doctrine of God implied in Christianity, it will share the unity which Christianity itself has, in virtue of its source and object; and the links between its different

portions will be continuous. And thus when we theologise, or define the knowledge we have of God through Christ, in order to translate it into scientific form, all our labour rests upon the presupposition that our faith is genuinely a whole, and can be shown to be so. We take for granted that at no point shall we be put to confusion as intelligent or religious men, by coming upon a doctrine which is isolated and incoherent, wholly out of relation, "like a rock in the sky." And this assumption, as we cannot too often recollect, is itself a warning and a test. For if we find in the traditional theology this or that element which is in imperfect relation to the Evangelical conception of Jesus Christ, the centre and core of the entire doctrinal construction, there is, as we instinctively feel, something wrong somewhere. Either tradition has turned down a wrong road at this point, and failed to approach the truth in question by the avenue proper to Christian thought; or the doctrine itself is a mere excrescence, an incubus because a superfluity, and must be straightway cast out. There is room in the Christian system for nothing but saving truth.

It may perhaps be objected that the claims now made for the quality of system in Dogmatic are excessive, especially in view of the clear statement of St. Paul that "we know in part, and we prophesy in part." It is indeed true that theology must ever be only in part. We know no more than sinners deserve to know, and that is but a fragment. And besides that, a tentative and incomplete character is forced on theology by the inevitable circumstance that in dealing with religion, it is dealing with a living thing. Life, by its very idea, is the perpetual despair of thought. Experience, when we begin to reflect upon it, is already something that has been lived through; and in the very act of coming to full self-consciousness, it has parted with a certain element in its freshness and its passion. Meditation comes halting in the rear of personal history,

and while we are analysing what we thought and felt an hour ago, some further thing is possessing our heart already. "When philosophy," said Hegel, with a touch of melancholy, "when philosophy paints its grey in grey, some one shape of life has meanwhile grown old: and grey in grey, though it brings it into knowledge, cannot make it young again. The owl of Minerva does not start upon its flight until the evening twilight has begun to fall." And if theology, in this respect at least, shares the fortunes and partakes in the deficiencies of philosophy, is it not a mistake, it may be said, to claim for it the high and august character of a system? Is not this as much as to say that, as an explanation of things, or at least of Christian experience, it is adequate and final? And how is this to be combined with the certainty, of which the believing mind cannot divest itself, that in the Christian salvation there is a vast residuum of as yet unappropriated truth, an unfathomable deep of gracious meaning out of which new and unforeseen disclosures may at any moment, and do from time to time, break forth?

Considerations such as these are deeply impressive; they are so true, so peremptory, so undeniable. Yet we may surely concede their truth without prejudice, as lawyers say, to the idea of system, of proportion, of organic and reciprocal interdependence, which we take to be characteristic of the diverse elements in the theological structure. The quality of wholeness is implicitly present in religious belief, because it is present first of all in the reality which belief apprehends. No doubt there are degrees of knowledge; yet all degrees are animated and explained by the ideal of an articulate unity to be known. The forester, the botanist, the painter study the tree before them each with a different interest; nor do the conclusions of all three, when summed together, exhaust the meaning of the tree for a perfect knowledge; yet it is only as a living whole that it has any reality

for their minds. On every hand we are confronted with unities which are indivisible because they are alive, and their members, though logically separable, interpenetrate each other, and are always more or less united in existence and operation; we know them as wholes, even when we fail to discover what it is that makes them wholes. And for us, in our study of Christian truth, the same assumption is indispensable; while, as to the grounds on which it may be justified, provisionally we may say, as has been said already, that Christianity has its unity in and through Jesus Christ, the consistency of His Person, the coherent oneness of His work and influence. Christ is not divided; therefore the divisions and subdivisions of our systems are less final than they seem. The doctrines have a right to live only as they hold their life in fee from Him, and bring some real aspect of the eternal grace that is in Him to expression. Without this conviction the theologian cannot start; he does not feel it worth while to go on. And above all, for those who are to preach Christianity, it must be a point of settled conviction that the contents of our religion form a single organism of truth, capable of consistent and unified statement, and that the secret of this unity is Jesus Christ.

Already I have had occasion more than once to use the word *scientific*—as when I said that in theology the attempt is made to put our knowledge of God into scientific form. But what is meant by the term scientific when employed in this connexion? To answer this natural and indeed inevitable query, it is needful to remember that the word science may be used of the study either of *things* or of *persons*; and that its connotation is bound to vary according to the objects upon which it is directed. In physics, chemistry, botany, the mind is dealing with *things*, and dealing with them scientifically; and one not infrequently hears language which implies that this is the only sphere in which knowledge can attain really valuable

results. But to refute this rash assertion the sciences of history, ethics, sociology present themselves, with the protest that the character of science cannot be denied to these disciplines, except on the principle that among the objects of experience only those can be truly known which are *unlike* us in their inner nature, as being impersonal or inanimate; while personality, or mind itself, is the one unknowable thing in the world. The proverb that like is known by like is a safer guide than any theory which thus threatens to make cognition stand on its head. Accordingly, when theology professes to apprehend realities of a personal, and therefore of an unseen and supersensible kind, we shall not be daunted by the objection that no genuine science can travel beyond the categories of time and space.

A full and satisfactory treatment of this subject, it is true, can be given, or at least attempted, only at a later point, when we face the problems, as numerous as they are difficult, which cluster round the nature of religious knowledge. But even here it may be said that science, in the only sense in which it is worth while to use the word, is simply the persistent effort to reach an orderly interpretation of experience, the effort of the mind to discover, in the course and movement of all outward things, intellectual principles which are identical with its own. The experience under review may be sensible, or social, or ethical, or intellectual, or religious; but in each case what happens is that a science or a group of sciences applies itself persistently to reduce the facts to intelligibility by the formation of hypotheses or theories, and the unceasing alteration and correction of these theories, till they correspond with and account for the experiential facts from which they set out. Take away the experience, that is, and you take away the science; for you quench the only interest which the mind can possibly feel in the scientific process—the interest, namely, of explaining facts which have actually entered into our life.

These facts, as I have hinted, may be placed in a graduated scale of value and reality, according as they concern merely some isolated intellectual faculty, or appeal to our entire personality. Mathematics, the most abstract of sciences, is an instance of the one class; ethics may be taken as illustrative of the other. And what one is moved to protest against is the tendency to restrict the term science to the most abstract and hypothetical conceptions of the mind, and to refuse it to those which are growingly concrete, growingly in contact with reality. There never has been a perfect line in real nature, a line, that is, which is all that a line should be; and our reasonings about lines, therefore, if applied to the actual world of fact, require instantly to be modified and qualified in many ways; otherwise, as we all know, they would issue in error and absurdity.¹ On the other hand, there has once been a perfect human Life, a life which was all that a life should ever be; so far from our thoughts about it being too ideal for the actuality, we know that nothing we can ever think exhausts or even adumbrates the fulness that was in Him. And if science means concrete knowledge,—knowledge, valid and certain, of things as they actually exist,—what justice is there in calling trigonometry science and refusing the name to Christian theology? I mean, is it possible to deny that the experience in the one case is infinitely more real and concrete than in the other; and that the richer species of cognition has the better claim to rank as knowledge proper?

Still, while this is true, we need not fall into the error of the intellectualist, or be confused by a plausible and therefore most malign fallacy which gave more trouble, perhaps, to a former generation than it appears to do to ours. For it used to be affirmed, especially by writers of the Hegelian school, that the task of Dogmatic is to raise faith

¹ Cf. Illingworth, *Reason and Revelation*.

to the level and the insight of knowledge. The formula has its uses, but it is at least liable to misinterpretation. If it means that Dogmatic strives to cast the utterances of naïve piety into intellectual form, that is true enough, as it is also obvious enough. For example, it is often needful to strip off the dress of figure and imagery worn by religious ideas in popular usage, before they can be fitted into their place in a theological system; and if it only be kept in mind that the figurative character of certain religious ideas is really their salvation, and gives them their hold upon our hearts, no harm will come of the application of this principle. But in the hands of most of its champions, the principle meant something very different. It meant that the specifically religious element in belief was to be evaporated into metaphysic. Now, without losing our way in the details of criticism, we may at least say that this attempt to turn the theologian into a pure metaphysician offends against the fundamental maxim that the student of Dogmatic is no dispassionate scientist, but a servant of the Church of Christ. He is a believer; the faith once delivered to the saints is his faith. For him, as for the Apostles, personal union to the living Christ is not merely the secret of the Christian life; it is also the organizing principle of Christian thought and theory. And thus the propositions of a true Dogmatic still remain the utterances of personal faith as really as the appeal of the evangelist, or the prayers of the simplest believer in his cottage among the hills. Indeed it would not be too much to say that the doctrine which cannot be turned into a sermon, and preached, is not worth its place in a system of Dogmatic.

The relations of theology and philosophy, however, are not, I need hardly say, of a purely negative or exclusive sort. The practice of most theologians of repute, when embarking on their enterprises in divinity, has been to

justify the existence of systematic theology by an appeal to considerations of a more or less philosophical kind ; and Ritschl, while honourably known for his services in banishing speculative rationalism from the domain of Christian doctrine, was himself no exception to the rule. Every one who begins to theologise feels how strong is the demand of intelligence for rational unity, the inconsequence of any abrupt cessation of the work of reflection, the necessity, above all, of some criterion which will distinguish the true elements of religious experience from the false. And these are philosophical ideas. In dealing with its special object, theology claims to possess no special organ of knowledge by an appeal to which inconvenient questions may be evaded. It works with the ordinary instruments of thought. No doubt valuable results can be expected only from those who sympathize with the aspirations of faith ; but the same may be said, *mutatis mutandis*, of æsthetics or sociology or ethics.

Furthermore, religious experience has a cognitive side. The judgments of faith claim to be true of a reality, of a system of things, existing quite independently of our interest in it. And to conceive this world of divine and spiritual being at all, we need conceptions which are philosophical if they are anything. What other name can be given to such ideas as personality, or end, or cause ? It is open to a theologian, indeed, to repudiate the meaning assigned to terms like these by the dominant philosophical school, but the modifications he may propose leave them as metaphysical as ever. Both theology and philosophy, again, are bound to discuss such questions as the possibility of miracle, or the theoretical efficacy of proofs of the existence of God. And while the argument in each case may take a different route, there is no difference of kind between the principles they apply, the criteria they seek to conform to, or the idea of truth which obtains in each department. Christian

theology has refused, and refused [rightly, to submit to the tyranny of any particular system of metaphysics, or to use no terms but those that might be licensed by the philosophy of the day. Yet it has done so from no aversion to the general method of philosophy, which it accepts as its own, but from the conviction that the system in question has done violence to certain elements in faith by forcing them into logical formulas too narrow for their content.

Again, it would be ungrateful to forget that the long labour of philosophy has done a great, or rather an inestimable, service to theology by clarifying and elaborating a more or less complete set of ideas and technical terms which enable the modern divine to do his work. Putting eccentricities aside, it may be said that we build upon the assured results of logic, psychology, and ethics. And in this region, we do well to keep gratefully in mind the intellectual toil of the Middle Ages, when so much was done to survey the continent of mind, and to estimate its logical potentialities. No doubt the schoolmen had their limitations; their Platonism on the one hand, and their Scepticism on the other, made it all but impossible that they should do justice to the new and revolutionary truth of Christianity. But within these limits their work was of noble proportions, and it is a writer of real insight who has said that "in raising their theologico-philosophical structures they were fellow-workers with the architects of the great Gothic cathedrals and monastic churches of that very age. And though modern thought passed into fresh fields by rejecting considerable masses of their work, yet in certain main issues the rejections were much less extensive than is commonly supposed, and many of their leading thoughts persisted under new guises, and persist still."¹ A good deal of specious nonsense, indeed, has been talked about the dry and futile discussions of Scholasticism; although I

¹ Caldecott, *Selections from the Literature of Theism*, p. 38.

observe that this is not the language held by those who have gone most deeply into the subject.

On the other hand, however, this immense difference remains, and will ever remain, to mark theology off from philosophy, that theology is not so much concerned to discover truth, as to interpret it. For the theologian starts from a great datum. On the objective side he starts from the Gospel as realized and embodied in the historical Person of Jesus Christ, the Crucified and Risen Lord; on the subjective side, he starts from the consciousness of redemption through union to Christ. This is the situation which he is brought in to explain; and the Christian mind has no use for any theology that does not accept and deal with these facts as it finds them, or that seeks to persuade the simple believer that in giving Jesus a place, and a central place, in the Gospel, he is only the victim of decadent Greek metaphysics. Christ, and the absolute certainty of saving union to Christ, constitute our immovable point of departure; and thus it is not surprising that speculative systems, even though to some extent they employ the same principles of thought and criticism, should occasionally arrive at results so unrecognizable, so unlike the Christian verities as we find them in the writings of St. Paul and St. John. For they are really building with quite other materials than the Christian thinker, and on quite other foundations. Theology, I mean, when properly aware that its business is to deal with the specifically Christian experience, takes the unconditional truth and value of the revelation in Jesus for granted; whereas for pure philosophy this is still an open question. *Philosophia*, as the old maxim has it, *philosophia veritatem quaerit, religio sc. religio revelata veritatem possidet*. This is frequently demurred to as an overstatement, and even cited as a typical instance of how superciliously self-assertive theology can be. But obviously there is no choice; you cannot believe in Chris-

tianity at all without believing that it is the truth which is at the root of everything. Moreover, there are words of Jesus Himself on record which make any other view a treachery to the faith. We cannot forget that He said: "Neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him," or again, "I am the way, and the truth, and the life." *There* is the note of absolute and irrefragable certitude; and theology is false to its own duty and honour if it fails to preserve that note, not indeed as pertaining to its theoretical constructions, but as an inherent quality of the basis of fact on which it stands. Nor is anything more sure than the fact that you cannot meet the perplexities of men who are baffled by the enigmas of all this unintelligible world, except by holding forth to them a Gospel which is not only very great and very wonderful, but indisputably true. A conjecture may have its own charm as an intellectual toy. The pastime of forming religious hypotheses, and dissolving them again, is one of the most fascinating in which the dialectical voluptuary can engage. But moments come in every life when their essential hollowness is felt, and felt with a certain shame. In hours of fierce temptation a theory which is no more than a theory is but a broken reed, which will pierce and poison the hand that leans on it. And still more impotent do we feel hypotheses to be when we are called in to aid the man whose faith is being assailed by doubt. You must have some sure word to offer him; you cannot press a conjecture; for, in the words of Professor James, "who says hypothesis renounces the ambition to be coercive in his arguments." And another brilliant and suggestive writer has touched the same point, and named it the problem of our time. "There is abroad among thinking men of all schools," he says, "a greater consciousness of the mystery of existence. There is also an increased anxiety for some means by which to come to terms with that mystery. If Christianity is to

win and hold the allegiance of the modern mind, it must be able, if not to solve the great problems, at least to make them endurable." ¹ Endurable they can be made only by the gift of a great all-embracing assurance, and this it is the task of Christian doctrine to bestow. Let it consent to lay aside the note of certainty, and the reason for its very being is gone.

I have tried to urge that the distinction between Christian doctrine and philosophy is at bottom, at least very largely, the distinction between certainty and conjecture. But of course this dictum would have to be largely qualified. And perhaps the easiest way in which to suggest the proper qualification is to go on to say that the same distinction must be re-introduced within the sphere of theology itself. Here, too, we must clearly distinguish the central orb of light from the penumbral haze by which it is surrounded; or, as it has been put elsewhere, "we must map off the realm of certitudes from the region in which assurance is unattainable, and in which variety of speculation is admissible." What I mean may become clearer if I take an example, and the example I will take is the doctrine of the Atonement. We are told by many voices, and in particular by one voice of singular clearness and power, that in regard to this topic it is really illegitimate to distinguish the fact of the Atonement from the theory. "There is no such thing conceivable," it is said, "as a fact of which there is no theory, or even a fact of which *we* have no theory; such a thing could never enter *our* world at all; if there could be such a thing, it would be so far from having the virtue in it to redeem us from sin, that it would have no interest for us and no effect upon us at all." ² In a sense this is very true; only, if the practice of human life is any guide, it is not so true as its opposite. "In every other province of human

¹ C. F. D'Arcy, *Idealism and Theology*, p. 168.

² Denney, *Studies in Theology*, p. 106.

thought," says Dr. Dale, "we ascertain the facts first—make sure of *them*—and try to explain them afterwards. We never deny the facts because we find them inexplicable. . . . And it may be that we shall find ourselves unable to give any account of the relation between the death of Christ and the forgiveness of sin; and yet the fact that the death of Christ is the ground of forgiveness may be so certain to us as to be a great power in life."¹ It is true that the mind finds it hard to rest satisfied with the fact. It is true that it demands a doctrine, an explanation, a complete theory. But then the mind demands many things, in this life of guilt and clouded vision, that it simply cannot have. It may have adumbrations of a theory; it does have them; only we may be sure in advance that the great reality has depths in it which our line is too short to fathom. And while holding, as I do, that "Christ bore our sins in His own body on the tree," that we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins, and that the doctrine which denies this is not recognizable as New Testament Christianity, I still find in the believing consciousness something which echoes to the declaration that "all that has ever been written on the subject only leaves behind the sense of the wonder of the mystery, and every explanation that has been attempted is overthrown with an ease which warns us that explanation is impossible. Every statement of the doctrine which has ever yet been made always contains those self-contradictions, those manifest breaches of the plainest rules of logic, which indicate that the human intellect is baffled." This also is an overstatement of the case; it is not possible that the meaning of the Cross should be wrapped in pure impenetrable darkness; we have the elements of a doctrine, and something more; yet it is a side of the truth which we must vindicate over and over again. The affectation of a spurious certainty regarding

¹ *Christian Doctrine*, p. 223.

what after all are no more than intellectual hypotheses, it is probable, has had too much to do with the aversion of the general mind from systematic theology. And the refusal to bind the fact of the Atonement indivisibly to all the details and all the refinements of any theory is the first step in assuring the real progress of the theory itself, as it freely strives ever more adequately to interpret the infinite fact. While at the same time it escapes the real, and sometimes the terrible, danger of leading men to believe that when their intellectual conceptions of the Atonement fall in ruins, they forfeit thereby the benefits that are ours through the Cross, or have lost the right to believe on the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world. This may be enough to indicate the need for drawing the distinction between certainty and theoretical construction, even within the precincts of theology itself.

Passing then from the relations of theology and philosophy, let us glance, ere we close, at a point of somewhat kindred interest. If Dogmatic is not a philosophical, is it then a historical science? Now we were led to note that a real difficulty emerges when it is asked how a science can deal with realities of an unseen and supersensible kind, and it is under the pressure of a similar difficulty, no doubt, that some have been moved to define Dogmatic as a purely historical discipline. Thus, for example, it has been urged, as by Schleiermacher and in a modified fashion by Rothe, that the task of Dogmatic is to give an orderly and articulate view of the doctrines prevailing in a specific Church at a specific time. But this attempt to place our science under the general heading of history has had little success; and for two reasons. In the first place, it has become increasingly clear that theology—whose object is not Church doctrine—but Divine revelation, is dealing with realities which, although they entered the stream of human life at a particular spot in the past, and consequently are historical,

yet arise above the limits of mere history, and belong to all time and all existence. Jesus Christ is indeed a figure in the annals of the world; His name is found upon the pages of ancient authors; yet it is the experience of countless multitudes to-day that He is the most urgent and substantial reality of their inward life. Mere history has no rules for dealing with such a phenomenon; and the historian who understands the limits of his province is quite aware that it is *ultra vires* for him to estimate aright a Person who is thus a historical datum, and yet claims to be of infinite significance for every soul that has ever lived. And in the second place, Dogmatic refuses to be classed among the sciences of history, because it cherishes ideals. It is interested not merely in what has been believed, but even more in what ought to be believed. It is a normative science; it sets up a standard of truth and value. It criticises the past. That criticism must be full of sympathy, or it will do no good; it must be full of humility, or it will do incalculable harm; but these conditions, difficult as they are, still may be fulfilled. It is another question from what source the norm of Christian doctrine should be drawn. In point of fact, of course, it has been drawn from a variety of sources—from Scripture, as a presumably consistent whole; from some selected portion of Scripture, which has been assigned decisive importance; or from the contents or the presuppositions of an ideal Christian experience. But whatever our conclusions on this thorny problem, at least the impossibility of ranking a normative science as historical is transparently clear.

This really implies, I need hardly say, that Dogmatic, as a science which is working towards an ideal, is bound to contain an element which is so far subjective and mutable. For naturally each theologian will put in operation a different set of criteria. He cannot think with any other mind than his own; he cannot live in any other age than

his own; he cannot change experiences with any one else not even St. Augustine; and it follows that his attitude to the traditions of the past must be a personal one. His use of Scripture, for example, will of necessity be modified by the position and progress of Biblical science in his day. Whereas a writer belonging to the third century would use Scripture, by a kind of second nature, in a predominantly allegorical sense, the historical and scientific methods of modern exegesis have made this once for all impossible. And if it be said that this appears to commit the theology of the Church to the vagaries of mere caprice, and the cry be raised for some inflexible rule by which to measure the correctness of opinions, it must be replied that no *legal* guarantee for unchanging orthodoxy can ever be given. Nothing in Christianity, let us be thankful, can be guaranteed in that way. At all events, if you call in the law, in whatever form, to protect the Gospel, you have to pay heavily for it in the end.¹ There are better sureties, too, within the reach of the Christian mind. We have the promise of the Holy Spirit, to lead the Church into all truth; we have the Word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever, and to which the Spirit bears witness perpetually in the hearts of men. These are the real,—these, when we speak strictly, are the only and the sufficient—guarantees that the mind of the believer, working freely on its data, will reach conclusions that are in line with the great faith of the past.

But in accepting this, which is after all only one of the honourable risks of Protestantism, we are putting our trust, not in the letter of symbol or confession, but in the life and power of the Holy Ghost. And as we look back, over the chequered history of doctrinal development, we seem to mark His divine guidance as it leads theologians, gradually, and doubtless with many times of retrogression, to be

¹ Cf. Denney, *Studies in Theology*, p. 195.

resolute and thorough in the effort to look at every doctrine in the pure light of the Person of Christ. "He shall take of mine, and shall show it unto you"—the promise is being fulfilled unto this day. And so far as it is fulfilled in our experience, as believers and as students of theology, it will bring us to apply the principle, unflinchingly but not, I trust, hastily, or without sympathetic care, that no doctrine can retain its place in the Christian creed save those which strike their roots deep down into the living union that binds the Christian to his Lord. It must be left, however, to the believing instinct of the individual to say when this condition is satisfied. And thus once more we turn back to the truth that the theologian must be a Christian, in frank and warm accord with the Church's common faith. The notion, widely spread though it be in Scotland, that any given man is equally fit to form a judgment on doctrine with any other, is a pure mistake, though it is one of which we find it very hard to clear our minds. There are those who have no right to an opinion respecting Christian truth; they have never sought or gained an experimental knowledge of Christ's redeeming grace; and we know that the secret of the Lord is with them that fear Him. But to the man who understands what he is doing, his theology is part of his Christian life. As he realizes afresh every day what God has done for him in Jesus, he feels that he has within his grasp the one standard of all value and all reality; and that without the decisive guidance afforded by this inward certainty, men are only playing at theology. Yes! the knowledge we have of divine truth will to the end be relative and in part; but the conviction with which we hold it may still be in essence absolute.

And it is thus, after all, that theology serves the Church—by feeding and illumining the new conviction that fills the Christian mind. It is thus, I repeat, that it serves

the Church ; for conviction is the true spring and cause of preaching ; nothing else will turn a doctrine into a Gospel. If Christianity is true, then it is designed for proclamation ; it has not begun to be what it aims at being until it is proclaimed. And for this reason the science we study here is alive and wholesome only as it springs from an indestructible certainty that in Jesus Christ we have God personally present in the world for the rescue and salvation of men, and as it moves men in consequence to go out to their fellows, making great affirmations as to the grace that is in Him for a world of sin. It is my hope and prayer that in the Dogmatic class-room still, as throughout the past, an impression of Christianity may be given which will make men eager to preach it. There we shall be occupied, not with the puzzles and enigmas of human thought, which too often reveal to us our weakness, but with the glorious Gospel of the blessed God, which is a revelation of our strength ; for strong we are indeed if God has love and we have faith. And while we shall never, I trust, forget the limitations of our insight, yet we shall take for granted from the first that God has made clear and simple what He meant by Christ, and that He meant salvation. We shall build upon the belief that it was the need and darkness of man that bespoke the compassion of the Most High, and that what He has given so freely in the Person of His Son is in the main not a problem to be wrestled with, but a gift to be received. For to treat these matters as open questions would be to affect ignorance of what every simple Christian knows perfectly well. It is a more excellent way, surely, to assume the Christian faith as the final truth for man, and diligently to search out its implications.

H. R. MACKINTOSH.

LITERARY ILLUSTRATIONS OF ECCLESIASTES.

vii. 15. "The two main qualities for a long life are a good body and a bad heart" (Fontenelle); cf. M. Arnold's *Mycerinus*.

vii. 16. "The book has been said, and with justice, to breathe *resignation at the grave of Israel*. . . Attempts at a philosophic indifference appear, at a sceptical suspension of judgment, at an easy *ne quid nimis* [vii. 16]. Vain attempts, even at a moment which favoured them! shows of scepticism, vanishing as soon as uttered before the intractable conscientiousness of Israel" (*Literature and Dogma*, chap. ii.).

"Man is neither angel nor brute, and the misfortune is that whoever would play the angel plays the brute" (Pascal).

"As an aged man of the world, whose recollections went back into the last century, is reported to have said, 'When I was young, nobody was religious; now that I am old, everybody is religious, and they are *both* wrong'" (Jowett).

"No man undertakes to do a thing for God, and lays it aside because he finds perseverance in it too much for him, without his soul being [seriously] damaged by it. He has taken up a disadvantageous position. This is not a reason for not trying, but it is a reason for trying soberly, discreetly, and with deliberation" (F. W. Faber).

"Almost everybody you see in Oxford believes either too much or too little" (Phillips Brooks).

vii. 21. "Here is commended the provident stay of inquiry of that which we would be loth to find: as it was judged great wisdom in Pompeius Magnus that he burned Sertorius' papers unperused" (Bacon.)

vii. 23 f. "Perhaps the best part of old age is its sense of

proportion, which enables us to estimate misfortunes, or what seem to be such, at their true value" (James Payn, *Nineteenth Century*, September, 1897).

vii. 28. "There are only two good men: one is not born yet, and the other is dead" (Confucius).

"I began to . . . get an especial scorn for that scorn of mankind which is a transmuted disappointment of preposterous claims" (George Eliot). See Lowell's *Sonnets*, iv.

"Thou wilt spare us the cynical pout
At humanity: sign of a nature bechurled.
No stenchy anathemas cast
Upon Providence, women, the world.
Thy knowledge of women might be surpassed:
As any sad dog's of sweet flesh when he quits
The wayside wandering bone." (George Meredith.)

vii. 29. "You have had false prophets among you—for centuries you have had them—solemnly warned against them though you were; false prophets, who have told you that all men are nothing but fiends and wolves, half beast, half devil. Believe that, and indeed you may sink to that. But refuse that, and have faith that God 'made you upright,' though *you* have sought out many inventions; so, you will strive daily to become more what your Maker meant and means you to be, and daily gives you also the grace to be" (Ruskin, *Crown of Wild Clive*, lect. iii. 107).

viii. 8. Cf. Ruskin's *Time and Tide* (Letter xxiv.) for an application of the words, *there is no discharge in that war*; also Kipling's *The Five Nations*, pp. 185 f.

viii. 11. :

"And so the siege and slaughter and success—
Whereof we nothing doubt that Hohenstiel
Will have to pay his price, in God's good time,
Which does not always fall on Saturday
When the world looks for wages." (Browning.)

viii. 11 (cf. vii. 7, etc.). "Swift once asked Delany whether the 'corruptions and villainies of men in power did

not eat his flesh and exhaust his spirits?' 'No,' said Delany. 'Why, how can you help it?' said Swift. 'Because,' replied Delany, 'I am commanded to the contrary—*fret not thyself because of the ungodly.*' That, like other wise maxims, is capable of an ambiguous application. As Delany took it, Swift might perhaps have replied that it was a very comfortable maxim—for the ungodly. His own application of Scripture is different. It tells us, he says, in his proposal for using Irish manufactures, that 'oppression makes a wise man mad.' If, therefore, some men are not mad, it must be because they are not wise. In truth, it is characteristic of Swift that he could never learn the great lesson of submission even to the inevitable. His rage, which could find no better outlet, burnt inwardly and drove him mad" (Leslie Stephen's *Swift*, pp. 165-166). Cf. Sterne's *Sermons* (No. xxxiii.).

ix. 1. See Calvin's *Institutes*, III. ii. 38.

ix. 9.:

"A little cot in a little spot

With a little heaven was sent;

A little way from that cot each day;

A song to sing and a word to say;

A little winter, a little May,

And a heart content—content!"

A little wife and a little life

In love and duty spent;

A song and sigh as the years go by;

A grave, perhaps, where the violets lie;

But a heaven on earth and a heaven on high,

And a heart content—content!"

"It is not by renouncing the joys which lie close to us that we shall grow wise. As we grow wise, we unconsciously abandon the joys that now are beneath us" (Maeterlinck). See also *Mark Rutherford's Autobiography*, p. viii. (preface to second edition), and R. L. Stevenson's lines on "The Celestial Surgeon" (in *Underwoods*).

"I shall marry Charlotte, we shall live here together

all our lives and die here,' thought Barnabas, as he went up the hill. 'I shall lie in my coffin in the north room, and it will all be over.' But his heart leaped with joy. He stepped out proudly like a soldier in a battalion" (M. E. Wilkins, in *Pembroke*).

ix. 10. "I lie down on my child's grave and fill my mouth with the clay, and say nothing. . . . But then, dear Mozley, do not think that I do not react under the stroke: I am not merely passive. *This is my action.* Death teaches me to *act thus*—to cling with tenfold tenacity to those that remain. A man might, indeed, argue thus. The pain of separation from those we love is so intense that I will *not love*, or, at least, I will withdraw myself into a delicate suspension of bias, so that when the time comes I may not feel the pang, or hardly feel it. This would be the *economical* view, and a sufficiently base one. But I am taught by death to run the fullest flood into my family relations. The ground is this. *He is gone*: I have no certain ground whatever for expecting that that relation can be renewed. Therefore, I am thankful that I actualized it intensely, ardently, and effectually, while it existed; and now I will do the same for what is left to me; nay, I will do much more; for I did not *do enough*. He and I might have been intertwined a great deal more, and that we were not appears to me now a great loss. In this, as in everything else, I accept the words of the Ecclesiast—'What thine hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for'—you know the rest" (*Letters of T. E. Brown*, vol. i. pp. 88, 89).

Do it with all thy might:—

"His career was one of unbroken shame. He did not drink, he was exactly honest, he was never rude to his employers, yet he was everywhere discharged. Bringing no interest to his duties, he brought no attention; his day was a tissue of things neglected and things done amiss; and from

place to place and from town to town, he carried the character of one thoroughly incompetent" (R. L. Stevenson, *The Ebb Tide*, chap. i.). See Ruskin's *Lectures on Art*, 86.

ix. 11. See Jowett's *College Sermons*, pp. 244 f.

ix. 14-15. "Here the corruption of states is set forth, that esteem not virtue or merit longer than they have use of it" (Bacon). See Spenser's *Ruines of Time*, 422 f. Also Addison in *The Spectator* (No. 464).

x. 6-7:—

"The brave, impetuous heart yields everywhere
To the subtle contriving head;
Great qualities are trodden down,
And littleness united
Is become invincible."

(Arnold's *Empedocles on Etna*.)

x. 13 f. "No world, or thing here below, ever fell into misery without having first fallen into folly" (Carlyle).

"The incendiary and his kindling combustibles had been already sketched by Solomon with the rapid yet faithful outline of a master in the art: *The beginning of the words of his mouth is foolishness and the end of his talk mischievous madness*. If in the spirit of prophecy the wise ruler had been present to our own times and their procedures; if while he sojourned in the valley of vision he had actually heard the very harangues of our reigning demagogues to the convened populace; could he have more faithfully characterized either the speakers or the speeches? Whether in spoken or in printed addresses, whether in periodical journals or in yet cheaper implements of irritation, the ends are the same, the process is the same, and the same is their general line of conduct. On all occasions, but most of all and with a more bustling malignity whenever any public distress inclines the lower classes to turbulence and renders them more apt to be alienated from the government of their country—in all places and at every opportunity pleading to

the poor and ignorant, nowhere and at no time are they found actually pleading for them" (Coleridge).—"I have seen wicked men and fools, a great many of both; and I believe they both get paid in the end, but the fools first" (R. L. Stevenson).

x. 20. "At Siena I was tabled in the house of one Alberto Scipioni, an old Roman courtier in dangerous times. . . . At my departure for Rome I had won confidence enough to beg his advice how I might carry myself securely there, without offence of others, or of mine own conscience. 'Signor Arrigo mio,' says he, '*pensieri stretti ed il viso sciolto* (thoughts close, countenance open) will go safely over the whole world'" (Sir Henry Wotton to Milton).

x. 20. In *The Life of a Scottish Probationer* (p. 114), there is an extract from a sermon preached by Thomas Davidson to the troops at Aldershot, which opens thus:—

"Over the entrance of a very old house in an ancient Scottish town, I read, not long ago, the following inscription:—

'Since word is thrall and thought is free,
Keep well thy tongue, I counsel thee';

that is to say, 'Speech is liable to criticism, and may bring you into trouble; be wise and careful, therefore, in the exercise of it.' The inscription, however, gathers additional significance from the fact that the house in question stands within a hundred yards of a royal residence, and must have been built at a time when a more stringent law of treason rendered it very dangerous to make very free, even in the most private of conversations, with anything appertaining to constituted authority."

xi. 1-2. See Ruskin's *Fors Clavigera* (ed. 1896), i. p. 372.

"Twas but in giving that thou couldst atone
For too much wealth amid their poverty."

(George Eliot.)

“Go, to the world return, nor fear to cast
 Thy head upon the waters, sure at last
 In joy to find it after many days.
 The work be thine, the fruit thy children’s part:
 Choose to believe, not see: sight tempts the heart
 From sober walking in true Gospel ways.”
 (Keble.)

xi. 4. “We ought to gather in souls as the farmer gathers under a lowering sky in autumn, believing that the storm may next day rush down upon his fields” (A. A. Bonar).

Arabian proverb: “The man who will not work becomes an astrologer.”

“There is no greater impediment of action than an over-curious observance of decency, and the guide of decency, which is time and season. For as Solomon saith [Eccles. xi. 4] . . . a man must make his opportunity, as oft as find it” (Bacon). See also Bacon’s *Essays*, lii.

xi. 7. “‘A pleasant thing it is to behold the sun,’ these first Gothic builders would seem to have said to themselves; and at Amiens, for instance, the walls have disappeared; the entire building is composed of its windows” (Pater’s *Miscellaneous Studies*, p. 110).

“The great sunlit square is silent—silent, that is, for the largest city on earth. A slumberous silence of abundant light, of the full summer day, of the high flood of summer hours whose tide can rise no higher. A time to linger and dream under the beautiful breast of heaven, heaven brooding and descending in pure light upon man’s handiwork. If the light shall thus come in, and of its mere loveliness overcome every aspect of dreariness, why shall not the light of thought, and hope—the light of the soul—overcome and sweep away the dust of our lives?” (Richard Jefferies, *Sunlight in a London Square*.)

xi. 8a.

“Life is worth living
 Through every grain of it,
 From the foundations
 To the last edge
 Of the corner-stone, death.”

(W. E. Henley.)

xi. 8 f. “ ‘ Would you judge of the lawfulness or unlawfulness of pleasure,’ she said, ‘ take this rule : whatever weakens your reason, impairs the tenderness of your conscience, obscures your sense of God, or takes off the relish of spiritual things ;—in short, whatever increases the strength and authority of your body over your mind, that thing is sin to you, however innocent it may be in itself.’ Well might Wesley consult upon such questions a mother who was capable of reasoning and writing thus. His father expressed a different opinion : ‘ All men,’ he said, ‘ were apt to verge towards extremes, but mortification was still an indispensable Christian duty. If the young man will *rejoice in his youth*, let him take care that his joys are innocent ; this, only this, remember, that *for all these things* God will bring him into judgment’ ” (Southey’s *Life of Wesley*).

JAMES MOFFATT.

(To be continued.)

CHARACTERISTICS OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK.

X.

WITH the discussion of *Tense*, which I take next because of its close connexion with last month's subject, we come again into the field of the familiar. It is, however, the field of all others in which the problems are most serious and most important for practical exegesis. On the Present stem, as normally denoting "linear" or durative action, I have already said almost enough. It has to be remembered that this belongs originally to certain present-stem conjugations alone, and that the effects of a primitive diversity may often be levelled by later analogical processes. That some presents are "point-words" is obvious. Thus Mr. Giles conjectures plausibly¹ that ἄρχεσθαι is really an aorist to the present ἔρχεσθαι, which would supply a sufficient reason for its kind of action. But it may indeed be suspected that point and line action were both originally possible in present and aorist stem formations which did not involve the addition of formative prefix or suffix. It would thus be largely due to analogical levelling that the present takes generally the durative character which belongs to most of its special conjugation stems. But this is conjectural, and we need only observe that the *punktuell* roots which appear in the present stem have given rise to the use of the so-called present tense to denote future time.² In αὔριον ἀποθνήσκωμεν we have a verb in which the perfective compound has neutralised the inceptive force of the suffix -ίσκω: it is only the obsolescence of the simplex which allows it

¹ *Manua' of Comparative Philology*,² p. 482. The *ap* will of course be the familiar weakening of *ep* which we see in *τραπέειν* against *τρέπειν*: *ap* and *pa* are the Greek representatives of vocalic *r*.

² Compare the close connexion between *aorist* (not present) subjunctive and the future, which is indeed in its history mainly a specialising of the former.

ever to borrow a durative action. *Εἶμι* in Attic is a notable example of the present of a point-root used for a future in the indicative. But though it is generally asserted that this use of present tense for future originates in the words with momentary action, this limitation does not appear in the New Testament examples, any more than in English. We can say, "I am going to London to-morrow" just as well as "I go": and *διέρχομαι* in 1 Corinthians xvi. 5, *γίνεται* in Matthew xxvi. 2, and other futural presents that may be paralleled from the vernacular of the papyri, have no lack of durativity about them. In this stage of Greek, as in our own language, we may define the futural present as differing from the future tense mainly in the tone of assurance which is imparted. That the Present is not primarily a *tense* in the usual acceptation of the term is shown not only by the fact that it can stand for future time, but by its equally well-known use as a past. The "Historic" present is divided by Brugmann (*Gr. Gram.*³ 484 f.) into the "dramatic" and the "registering" present. The latter occurs in historical documents with words like *γίγνεται*, *τελευτα*, etc., registering a date. *Γεννᾶται* in Matthew ii. 4 is the nearest New Testament example I can think of. The former, common in the vernacular of all Indo-Germanic languages—we have only to overhear a servant girl's "so she says to me," if we desiderate proof that the usage is at home among us—is abundantly represented in the New Testament. From that mine of statistical wealth, Hawkins's *Horae Synopticae*, we find that Mark uses the historic present 151 times, Matthew 93 times, Luke 8 times in the Gospel and 13 in *Acts*; also that it is rare in the LXX, except in *Job*, and in the rest of the New Testament, except in John's Gospel. I should not, however, take this to mean that it was "by no means common in Hellenistic Greek." Sir John Hawkins himself observes that it is common in Josephus, and of course it was abun-

dant in Attic. The fact that Luke invariably (except in viii. 49) altered Mark's favourite usage means, I think, that it was too *familiar* for his liking. I have not searched the papyri for this phenomenon, but I may cite No. 717 from the new Oxyrhynchus volume as a contemporary document in which a whole string of presents do duty in narrative. Josephus would use the tense as an imitator of the classics, Mark as a man of the people who heard it in daily use around him; while Luke would have Greek education enough to know that it was not common in cultured speech of his time, but not enough to recall the encouragement of classical writers whom he probably never read, and would not have imitated if he had read them. The limits of the historic present are well seen in the fact that it is absent from Homer, not because it was foreign to the old Achaean dialect, but because of its felt incongruity in epic style: it is absent from the *Nibelungenlied* in the same way.

Space forbids enlargement on this theme, and requires brevity in dealing with the Imperfect, a tense in which the classical force is still well maintained. Among the many points in which the Revisers have earned our gratitude for their treatment of the Tenses, the restoration of the *contative* imperfect must take a high place. What would St. Paul have thought of the translators who by missing this in Acts xxvi. 11 committed him to the statement that under terror from him weak Christians had actually renounced their Master! In itself, of course, ἠνάγκαζον there might be "I repeatedly forced"; but the sudden abandonment of the aorist gives a grammatical argument for selecting this well-known alternative, which is made certain by the whole tone of the Apostle in his retrospect. We can indeed but faintly imagine the difference to Paul's whole career, had his past included the guilt of soul-murder instead of mere killing of the body. For other typical examples of this imperfect we may compare Mark ix. 38,

Matthew iii. 14, Acts vii. 26, Luke i. 59. In the second and fourth of these the R.V. has corrected the old version, which in Acts *l.c.* has curiously blundered into the right meaning by mistranslating a wrong text.¹ In the first passage it is unfortunate that the Revisers should have corrected the text and then left the translation alone.

The *Aorist* raises many more questions than we can deal with here. Its "punktuell" character is well seen in contrast with the present stem in *δος σήμερον* against *δίδου τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν* in the two versions of the Lord's Prayer, or in *παραστήσατε* against *παριστάνετε* in Romans vi. 13. The growth of the constative use has, as we saw last month,² greatly diminished the extent of the contrast. On this, and on the Ingressive and Effective uses of the strictly momentary aorist, we must not dwell now. The association of the Aorist with past time is the subject on which our attention may best be concentrated. This is of course confined entirely to the indicative and the participle, except in a few cases where reported speech preserved the past sense of the indicative in the optative or infinitive which replaced it. Past time properly came out of the augment alone, but the participle acquired it by the idiomatic use in which it stands before an aorist indicative to qualify its action. As describing momentary action, or action viewed as a point, it naturally came to involve action precedent to the time of the main verb, and this meaning was extended to cases where it followed that verb. This was, however, not necessary. In many cases the participle and the verb finite are closely bound together as one action: the familiar

¹ The T. R. *συνήλασεν* would naturally mean that he "drove" them to shake hands.

² Professor Thumb kindly draws my attention to the article (*Indog. Forsch.* xii. 319 ff.) in which Meltzer controverted Miss Purdie's results. I had unaccountably overlooked it. I am glad, however, to find that Professor Thumb himself thinks that Miss Purdie is essentially right, and that Modern Greek is on this side.

example of ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε is as good as can be given. There are even cases where the participle seems to involve *subsequent* action. Thus, in the Fourth Pythian (l. 189) we have, "when the flower of his sailor-folk came down to Iolcos, Jason *mustered and thanked* them all" (λέξατο ἐπαινήσας). It is *coincident* action really, as Gildersleeve notes, but of course if Pindar had felt bound to chronicle the exact order of proceedings he would have put the muster first. I am strongly disposed to have recourse to this for the much-discussed ἀσπασάμενοι in Acts xxv. 13, though Hort's suspicions of "prior corruption" make me nervous. It might seem more serious still that Blass (*Grammar*, p. 197) pronounces "the reading of the majority of the MSS. . . . not Greek,"¹ for Blass comes as near to a revived Athenian as any modern could hope to be. But when he says that the "accompanying circumstance . . . cannot yet be regarded as concluded," may we not reply that in that case Pindar's ἐπαινήσας equally needs emending? The effective aorist κατήντησαν is very different from a durative like ἐπορεύοντο, which could only have been followed by a word describing the purpose before them on their journey. But in "they arrived on a complimentary visit" I submit that the case is really one of *identical* action. The R.V. text is accordingly correct. There are a good many New Testament passages in which exegesis has to decide between antecedent and coincident action, in places where the participle stands second: Heb. ix. 12 will serve as an example. It would take too much space to discuss as I should like the alleged examples of *subsequent* action participles for which Ramsay pleads (*Paul the Traveller*, p. 212).

¹ Blass here slurs over the fact that *not one uncial* reads the future. The paraphrastic rendering of the Vulgate cannot count, and a reading supported by nothing better than the cursive 61 had better be called a conjecture outright. (Blass's misquotation κατήλθον, by the way, is not corrected in his second edition.)

I confess myself unconvinced, but must reserve my defence.

There are naturally few places in the New Testament where the aorist indicative has in any way lost the sense of past time. Ἐβλήθη in John xv. 6 is paralleled by the classical use seen in Euripides, *Alc.* 386, ἀπωλόμην εἴ με λείψεις, where we prefer the perfect "I am done for": so in Romans xiv. 23 κατακέκριται (cf. Jannaris, *Hist. Gr.* § 1855 f). In ἐξέστη (Mark vii. 21) our English idiom uses the perfect ("He has gone out of his mind"), instead of the aorist of indefinite reference. Similarly, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα is "on thee I have set the seal of my approval." (It is unfortunate that in English the perfect tense has this neutral zone, in which it is impossible to determine whether it represents the aorist or the perfect of Greek. There is, for example, a very marked difference between the tense of Mark xvi. 6 and 1 Corinthians xv. 4. Ἠγέρθη states simply the past complete fact, while ἐγήγερται is concerned with its present abiding significance. And yet our idiom demands "He is risen" for the first, and in the second, since a definite point of time is named, somewhat rebels against the perfect which is imperatively demanded by the sense. See Dean Armitage Robinson's note on this subject, *The Study of the Gospels*, p. 107. In classical Greek we may find an aorist of this kind used with a sequence which would naturally suggest a foregoing perfect, as Euripides, *Medea* 213 f., ἐξήλθον δόμων μὴ μοί τι μέμφησθ'—where see Verrall's note. There remains the "Gnomic Aorist," which Winer need not have denied: James i. 11 and 1 Peter i. 25 are clear cases—see Hort's note on the latter. It survives in Modern Greek, according to Jannaris (*Hist. Gr.* § 1852).

At this point, as I am manifestly leaving the Aorist in an extremely unfinished condition, I must pause to explain that this paper cannot profess even the degree of complete-

ness which has been aimed at hitherto. To do this would involve undue extension, and I must attempt it elsewhere.¹ At present I must only endeavour to round off the subject at the very outset of the Verb, lest we should encroach upon another year's programme. I pass on then to the Perfect, the most important of all the tenses for us to understand. A cursory reading of the papyri soon shows us that the Perfect is used in the later vernacular very much more than in classical literature. The inference might be drawn that the Perfect has become a mere narrative tense, as it undeniably became at a later stage, and is a mere alternative for the Aorist. This would however in my opinion be entirely unwarrantable. I have found extremely few passages in the papyri of the earlier centuries A.D. in which an aoristic perfect is demanded, or even suggested, by the context. It is simply that a preference grows in popular speech for the expression which links the past act with present consequences. A casual example from the prince of Attic writers will show that this is not only a feature of late Greek. Near the beginning of Plato's *Crito* Socrates explains his reason for believing that he would not die till the third day. "This I infer," he says in Jowett's English, "from a vision which I *had* last night, or rather only just now." The Greek, however, is *τεκμαίρομαι ἔκ τινος ἐνυπνίου, ὃ ἐώρακα ὀλίγον πρότερον ταύτης τῆς νυκτός*, where point of time in the past would have made *εἶδον* as inevitable as the aorist is in the English, had not Socrates meant to emphasise the present vividness of the vision. It is for exactly the same reason that *ἐγγήγερται* is used with a time point in 1 Corinthians xv. 4.² Now

¹ In some *Prolegomena to New Testament Greek Grammar*, to be published next year by Messrs. T. & T. Clark. I have not yet done with the papyri and their lessons for New Testament students, and hope to take up the theme in a less technical series of papers in the *Expositor* in 1905.

² Cf. Rom. xvi. 7, and the 2nd cent. papyrus O.P. 477: *τῶν τὸ πέμπτον*

when this tendency grew beyond a certain limit, the fusion of aorist and perfect would be complete. But it must be observed that it was not the perfect which survived in the struggle for existence. In Modern Greek the old perfect forms only survive in the passive participle (with reduplication syllable lost), and in the *-κα* which was tacked on to the aorist passive (ἐδέθηκα for ἐδέθην). It does not appear that the perfect had in any way superseded the aorist—though in a fair way to do so—when it was itself attacked by the weakening of reduplication which destroyed all chance of its survival as a distinct form, in competition with the simpler formation of the aorist. But these processes do not set in for at least two centuries after the New Testament was complete. It is true that the LXX. and inscriptions show a few examples of a semi-aoristic perfect in the pre-Roman age, which, as Thumb remarks (*Hellenismus*, p. 153), disposes of the idea that Latin influence was working: cf. Jannaris, § 1872. But it is easy to exaggerate them. Thus in Exodus xxxii. 1 κεχρόνικε is not really aoristic (as Thumb and Jannaris), for it would be wholly irregular to put an aorist in *oratio obliqua* to represent the original present or perfect “Moses is tarrying” or “has tarried”: its analogue is rather the χρονίζει of Matthew xxiv. 48. Nor will it do to cite the perfects in *Hebrews*, e.g. xi. 17, where the use of this tense to describe what stands written in Scripture is a marked feature of the author’s style: cf. Plato, *Apol.* 28c, ὅσοι ἐν Τροίᾳ τετελευτήκασιν, as written in the Athenians’ “Bible.” In fact Matthew xiii. 46 is the only New Testament example cited by Jannaris¹ which impresses me at all. (I may quote in illustration of this O.P. 482 (2nd cent.) χωρὶς ὧν ἕπεγραψάμην καὶ πέπρακα). The distinction is very clearly seen

ἔτος . . . ἐφηβευκότων—a fusion of “who came of age *in*” and “who have been of age *since* the 5th year.”

¹ What is meant by the references to “John 6. 3, 6. 9”?

in papyri for some centuries. Thus τῆς γενομένης καὶ ἀποπεπεμμένης γυναικός (2nd cent.), “who *was* my wife and *is now* divorced”; ὅλον τὸν χαλκὸν [δεδα] πάνηκα εἰς αὐτό (3rd cent.), where an erased ἐ- shows that the scribe meant to write the aorist and then substituted the more appropriate perfect. As may be expected, illiterate documents show confusion most: e.g. O.P. 528 (2nd cent.) οὐκ ἐλουσάμην οὐκ ἤλιμε (= ἤλειμμαι) μέχρει ιβ Ἐθύρ (cf. EXPOSITOR VI. vi. 434). It is in the combinations of aorist and perfect that we naturally look first for the weakening of the distinction, but even there it often appears clearly drawn. At the same time we may find a writer like Justin Martyr guilty of confusion, as in *Apol.* i. 22 πεποιηκέναι . . . ἀνεγείραι, 32 ἐκάθισε καὶ εἰσελήλυθεν, 44 νοῆσαι δεδύνηνται καὶ ἐξηγήσαντο. And in the LXX. we find such a mixture as ἐτραυματίσθη . . . μεραλάκισται, Isa. liii. 5 (aor. in A).

I must not attempt anything like a discussion of the alleged aoristic perfects in the New Testament, the most probable of which are collected by Blass, *Gram.* 200. The case of γέγονα is the most difficult, as most of the others are mitigated by their having somewhat aorist-seeming forms:—εἶρηκα, ἔσχηκα end like ἔθηκα, ἀφήκα, and (like εἶληφα) have no obvious reduplication. (Πέπρακα is intelligible on account of the absence of aorist from the same root.) The affinities of γέγονα would naturally be with the present, and there seems small reason for letting it do the work of the common ἐγενόμην. Yet even Josephus (c. *Αριον.* 4. 21) has ὀλίγω πρότερον τῆς Πεισιστράτου τυραννίδος ἀνθρώπου γεγονότος, “who flourished a little before P.” From the papyri I may cite two 2nd cent. examples:—O.P. 478, “I declare that my son . . . has reached (προσβεβηκέναι) the age of 13 in the past 16th year of Hadrian . . . and that his father *was* (γεγονέναι) an inhabitant . . . and is now dead (τετελευτηκέναι)”; B.U. 136 διαβεβαιουμένον

τοῦ Π. μὴ γεγοῖναι τὸν πατέρα τῆς ἐκδικουμένης ὀνηλάτην. In the face of these examples it is hard to assert perfect force in Luke x. 36, or John vi. 25. But the case must be settled by the context in each passage. It will be found that among the 45 occurrences of *γέγονα* (indic.) the very large majority are in present time beyond dispute. I doubt if there is one for which an aoristic sense *must* be found. In Matthew xxv. 6 and elsewhere we may have a historic present, *γέγονα* being virtually *sum*, but that is another matter. The evidence just cited must make us chary of denying aoristic *γέγονα a priori*, but we are bound to admit it with the utmost caution. K. Buresch, in his well-known article "*Γέγοναν*" (Rhein Mus., 1891) notes an example of aoristic *γεγόνασι* in Plato (?) *Alcibiades*, p. 124a, but observes that in Greek which is at all decent this is never found. In later Greek, he proceeds, the use of *γέγονα* greatly increases. "It has present force always where it denotes a state of rest, preterite force where it denotes becoming. Hence *γέγονα* in innumerable cases is quite an equivalent of *εἰμί*, as with *existi, factus* or *natus sum*, etc." (p. 231 note). We may certainly assert without hesitation that even if a few exceptions are to be allowed in the particular words quoted—and only in a fraction of their occurrences can any case be made—in the immense majority of perfects in the New Testament the full perfect force is seen.

Before I close this article I should like to mention in advance a vernacular usage which I have not seen noted elsewhere. In the papyri there are a good many examples of the participle used instead of a finite verb, presumably by the ellipse of the substantive verb. The following stand for imperatives.¹ G. 35 (99 B.C.) *ἐαυτῶν δὲ ἐπιμελόμενοι ἴν' ὑγιαίνητε* (1st person plural precedes): so G. 30 (103 B.C.) *αλ.*—a standing formula. For the indicative these may be

¹ Abbreviations as in EXPOSITOR, VI. viii. 423.

cited. Tb. P. 14 (114 B.C.) τῶι οὖν σημαινόμενῳ Ἑρᾶτι παρηγγελκότες ἐνώπιον, "I gave notice in person" (no verb follows). Tb. P. 42 (*ib.*) ἡδικοημένος (no verb follows). A P. 78 (2nd cent.) βίαν πάσχων ἐκάστοτε, etc. (no verb). Tb. P. 58 (111 B.C.) γράψας ὅπως εἰδῆς, καὶ σὺ ἀναγωνιάτος ἴσθει. N.P. 49 (3rd cent.) ὅτι ". . . ἐξυγρήσαντες. . . καὶ . . . σφετερίσαντες, καὶ ἀπάντηκα αὐτοῖς. . . ." There are other examples, but these will serve to prove that it is needless to resort to anacoluthon and all manner of other devices to regularise Romans v. 11, xii. 9-13, 1 Peter v. 7, Ephesians v. 21, and other passages. Of course we must not overdo our new resource, as the construction cannot have been very common. It may be recalled that in a prehistoric stage Latin used the participle for an indicative, where the 2nd plur. middle for some reason became unpopular, and *sequimini* = *ἐπόμενοι* not only established itself in the present, but even produced analogy formations in future and imperfect, and in the subjunctive.¹ Cf. the constant ellipse of *est* in perf. indic. passive. (We may make the Hebraists a present of the parallel use of the Hebrew participle!) If one more analogy may be permitted, we might refer to the plausible connexion claimed between the 3rd plural indicative and the participle in all languages of our family: *bheronti* (*ferunt*, *φέρουσι*, *bairand*, etc.), and *bheront* (*ferens*, *φέρων*, *bairands*). These analogies are only meant to show that the use of the participle always lay ready to hand, with or without the auxiliary verb, and was a natural resource whenever the ordinary indicative (or, less often, imperative) was for any cause set aside.

¹ *Sequimini* imperative has a different history: cf. the old infinitive *ἐπίμεναι*, Skt. *sacamane*.

STUDIES IN THE FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN.

V.

THE INADMISSIBILITY OF SIN (*continued*).

THE Remover of sin is, of course, Himself without it. "And in Him there is no sin" sums up what has been said of Jesus in chap. ii. 2, in verse 3 above, in verse 7 below, and in chap. v. 20 at the end of the Letter. He is *δίκαιος*, *ἀγνός*, *ἀληθινός*. He is "the Son of God," "the Only-begotten"; "the eternal life" is His and was manifested to us in His earthly course. These predicates utterly exclude the notion of sin from our conception of Christ. This goes so much without saying and the negation of sin in Jesus Christ is so obvious, that it would be superfluous to state it here, but for the sake of the inference immediately to be drawn in verse 6: since "*in Him* there is no sin," no one "who abides *in Him*" can practise sin. The union of sin and Christ in the same heart is impossible. The man abiding in Christ lives in a sinless region; he sees a light unsullied, he breathes an air untainted. Sin has no foothold or lodgement in the realm where the redeemed walk with the risen Christ; it forms no part or parcel of the life that is hid with Christ in God.

Verses 6 and 7 deduce, with a fine combination of mysticism and blunt downright simplicity, the consequences for Christians of what St. John has testified about Jesus Christ Himself. If He is sinless and came for the express purpose of abolishing sin, if Christ and sin are essentially oppugnant and incompatible, then to harbour sin, to be on any terms with it, is to dissociate oneself from Him. Herein is the saying true: "He that is not with Me is against Me." Not only is the practiser of sin *ipso facto* out of Christ; his life argues that he always has been so,

and that his Christian profession was never genuine. "Every one that sins, has not seen Him nor known Him."¹ The same thing John had said of the "many antichrists," extruded from the Church and seducing its membership: "they went out from us, but they were not of us" (ii. 19). The outer severance, the visible acts of rebellion against the law of Christ, disclose an inner radical alienation of spirit from Him. Men of religious pretensions who live a life of deceit or impurity or lovelessness, who reconcile themselves to immoral practice and yet deem themselves Christians notwithstanding, had from the beginning—the Apostle supposes—no proper knowledge of the Lord they profess to serve. They have never really seen what Jesus Christ is like nor come to any true acquaintance with Him, or they would surely realize the absurdity of their position. For his own part, the writer felt that once to have known the Lord as he had done, made any other ideal of life impossible; once and for all the love of sin was killed in the disciple by the companionship of Jesus. He would no more think of returning to it now than the civilized man to the tastes and habits of the savage or the philosopher to the babblings of the child, or than the young prophet Isaiah to unclean talk after his vision of the Holy One of Israel. "The time past may suffice" to have wrought folly, to have lived in envy and malice. The sun is up! who that sees it can walk any longer as in darkness?

The contradiction, that lies on the surface, between verse 6, with its total exclusion of sin from the life of a Christian man, and chap. ii. 1 f., which provides for the case of a Christian brother falling into sin, was noticed in the first of this series of Papers (November 1903). There the aorist subjunctive suggested the possibility of such *an occurrence*

¹ The *perfects* οὐχ ἑώρακεν, οὐδὲ ἔγνωκεν, connote facts that have taken effect, the settled results of action, the state into which one has passed thereby.

(ἐάν τις ἁμαρτῆῃ : here the present participle (ὁ ἁμαρτάνων, ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν) presumes a habit and character, a mode of life. "Every one that sinneth, that doeth sin," is as much as to say "Every sinner, every one whose life yields sin for its product,"—or in the words of chap. i. 6, "who walks in the darkness." The Apostle is not dealing in casuistry. He has not before his mind the doubtful cases—doubtful to human judgement—that are on the border line of Christian assurance, where a man with a sincere faith and love has acted at some point inconsistently or has been "overtaken in some trespass." There are two broadly contrasted classes of men before his view, claiming the Christian name. He is dealing with pretenders to Christianity, who deliberately excuse sin and make room for it in their plan of life, who justify sin as allowable, as normal in the Christian man while still living in the body and under material conditions, and who see no necessity that the disciple should be as his Lord. So he reaffirms in verse 7, against the current delusions of Gnostical ethics, against all patrons and apologists of laxity in the Church, the axiom of moral common sense and of every honest Christian conscience : "Little children, let no one deceive you : he who *does righteousness* is righteous, even as He (the sinless Christ) is righteous." His doctrine equally disposes of the Antinomianism that goes about under an evangelical cloak, and would make the blood-stained robe of Christ's righteousness the cover for a loose morality,—as though the Lord had said to the absolved adulteress, "Go in peace, and sin again !"

4. Being negatively an un-Christian, anti-Christian thing, verse 8 affirms that sin is positively *diabolical*. The righteous Son of God stands forth as the leader of the sons of God, cleansed by His blood and abiding in His righteousness. For the doers of sin there is another leader ; they choose another patron and pattern : "He that commits sin

is of the Devil." The reason St John gives for ascribing this shameful complicity to sinners is that "from the beginning the Devil sins." There sin, so far as revelation indicates and according to the Apostle's theory of evil, took its rise,—from that most wretched and wicked being whom Scripture names "the Devil"—"the slanderer," and "Satan"—"the enemy" of man. Satan was the first to lapse from God; and he has continued in sin all along—he "sinneth from the beginning." From this personal source the law of sin and death first proceeded, and "the darkness" spread over the world, even as Christ's law of love and all the light of the Gospel were "from the beginning" in God the Father (i. 1, ii. 7, 13). Sin is Satan's domain, his sphere, his work; and every sinner is his ally and instrument. The committer of sin makes himself of the Devil's party, of the Devil's spirit, and finally—according to the fearful words of Jesus (Matt. xxv. 41)—of the Devil's doom. He is engaged in building up those "works of the Devil," which "the Son of God came that He might destroy"—*ἵνα λύσῃ*, "that He might pull down." Every such man is helping the enemy of God and man, the captain of rebellion, to maintain that fortress of evil, that huge rampart erected in the universe against the holy and almighty will of God, which we call "sin."

To follow such a leader is as futile a course as it is evil. It is to resist the whole design of the mission of Jesus Christ, and thereby to set oneself against the central stream of the purposes of God toward mankind, to take sides, as Jesus put it, with "the strong one armed" and in possession (cf. v. 19 below) against "the stronger than he," who is shortly "to spoil his house and take from him all his armour wherein he trusted." To espouse the cause of Satan against Christ is to embark on a doomed vessel, to enlist under the flag of despair. With triumphant certainty St. John writes, "For this end the Son of God was mani-

fested,—to undo the works of the Devil"! Unless the Son of God has come in vain, unless He has stepped into the arena to be vanquished, the mischief wrought by Satan in this world is to be undone; the entire confederacy, the compacted forces of evil will be dissolved. The empire of "the god of this world" shall be broken in pieces—*ἵνα λύσει τὰ ἔργα τοῦ διαβόλου.*

Included in "the works of the Devil," the life-work of every man who has served upon his side and stood for sin and the world against the Lord's Christ, is marked for destruction. *εἰς τοῦτο ἐφανερώθη . . . ἵνα λύσῃ κ.τ.λ.* is parallel to *ἐκεῖνος ἐφανερώθη ἵνα τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἄρῃ* in verse 5: men's "sins" are "the Devil's works"—there is a super-human potency and direction behind them—and in "taking away sins" Christ breaks up the fabric of evil in the world and brings Satan's kingdom to an utter end.

"Children of the Devil" (*τὰ τέκνα τοῦ διαβόλου*) at last St. John calls the Antinomian religionists outright, who neither do righteousness nor love their brethren (verse 10). He had the warrant for this epithet in the words with which the Lord Jesus stigmatized the Jewish party who sought His life, hating the light that shone in Him because their deeds were evil: "You are of your father the Devil, and the lusts of your father it is your will to do. He was a man-slayer from the beginning, and in the truth he standeth not. . . . He is a liar, and the father thereof" (John viii. 44). Those who claimed Abraham and, in the highest sense, God for their father, are referred to this dreadful paternity, since they abet Satan's desires and are tools to work his will against the true Son of God. Their moral affinity proved their spiritual descent. Their features betrayed their family. On the same principle Elymas the sorcerer was addressed by the Apostle Paul: "O full of all guile and all villany, *son of the Devil*, enemy of all righteousness . . . perverting the right ways of the Lord" (Acts xiii. 9 f.). It

gives an added odiousness and horror to transgression to consider that our moral offences are no detached and casual misdoings, beginning and ending with ourselves. They are instigated from beneath ; and they implicate us—each sinful deed so far as it goes, and those forms of sin that appear so light, so natural and pleasant—in that vast and malignant conspiracy against the government of God which is represented in the teaching of Christ and Scripture under the name of “the kingdom of darkness” and “of Satan.”

5. In his impeachment of sin in believers, St John comes round in the end to what, under other words, he had said at the beginning : Sin is *unnatural in the child of God* ; it is contradictory to the very being of the regenerate life, and constitutes the denial of its reality. Sin is as foreign to the character, as opposed to the true nature, of the man himself as it is alien to the Christ in whom he dwells, and as it is congenial and connatural to the Wicked One who tempts him.

The two sentences of verse 9 amount to this : as a matter of fact the child of God “does not do sin” (*ἁμαρτίαν οὐ ποιεῖ*)—the produce of his life is not of that kind ; further than this, as a matter of principle “he cannot sin.” In the former of these statements St. John is appealing to the facts : they are “manifest” (v. 10) ; the evidence is plain to any one who has eyes and cares to look. “We know,” he writes in the 14th verse, “that we have passed out of death into life, because we love the brethren” ; so in chap. ii. 13 f., “You young men are strong, and have overcome the Wicked One” ; in chap. v. 4, “This is the victory that has overcome the world,—it is our faith” ; finally, in chap. v. 18, “We know that every one that is begotten of God does not sin.” This was the witness of the Apostolic Christian consciousness to the moral efficacy of the Christian spirit. St. John’s faithful readers know how widely different their life is from what it had been before conver-

sion, from the daily life of the heathen around them—and, as he seems to imply, from the life of the Antichrists and false prophets, who thrust on them their presumptuous claims to a higher and more intimate knowledge of God than that reached through faith. There are the grapes and figs on the one side—"the fruit of the Spirit," in love and joy and peace; and the thorns and thistles giving their inevitable yield in "the works of the flesh," upon the other. The contrast was patent and palpable, in the actual state of society; and Christ's true disciples could not but "know that" they were "abiding in Him, from the Spirit He had given" them—in crying contrast as that was with the spirit of the world. Each believer had in himself the witness, open to be known and read by all men, of his new birth from God, in his freedom from sin, in the changed tenour of his life, in the purity and righteousness and affectionateness of his disposition and his daily walk. To one, and another, and another of his beloved flock the Apostle could point, and say: "There is a man begotten of God; for, look! he lives a life unstained by sin."

While behind all sin a Satanic inspiration and paternity are operative, so the righteousness of the Christian is due to "a seed of God abiding in him." There is a deep-hidden master force governing the man's behaviour, a mystic influence about him, a principle of Divine life and sonship acting itself out in his daily walk and counteracting "the spirit of the world" that breathes all around him (iv. 4; 1 Cor. ii. 12; 2 Cor. iv. 4), a "seed" which bears good fruit of righteousness where the evil fruit of sin once grew rankly. That "seed of God" dwelling in the believer in Christ is, doubtless, to St John's thought, *the Holy Spirit*, concerning whom he says later, in verse 24: "In this we know that He abideth in us, from the Spirit that He gave us." The *σπέρμα* of this passage is the *χρίσμα* of chap. ii. 27, which

invests the Christian with knowledge and power, which inspires him with purity and goodness. St. John's teaching about the Holy Spirit and His relations to individual Christian men is in full accordance with St. Paul's, who recognizes in this gift of the Father at once the seal of the adoption of the Sons of God and the seed of all Christian growth and fruitage in them. There are two principles, two lines of spiritual heredity and propagation, diametrically opposed: the filiation from God and from the Devil respectively, "the Spirit" with his "fruit" and "the flesh" with its "works," each "lusting against" the other (to use St. Paul's language on the subject in Galatians v. 16-24). Each desires what its opposite abhors. To be "led by the Spirit" is to "mortify the deeds of the body" (Rom. viii. 5, 13); it is to work the works of God and to counterwork, in and around oneself, "the works of the Devil."

Thus sin is excluded not by mere avoidance and repression, but by preoccupation. God's seed "abides in" the Christian heart. The man is possessed by another generative, fruitful principle. As in land full of good seed, actively germinating, weeds want the room to grow; so in a soul filled with the Holy Spirit, where He dwells at the sources of feeling and impulse, touching all the springs of action and breathing on all the issues of life, where this God-planted "seed" sends its roots into the depths and its branches into the heights and breadths of the man's nature—what place can there be for sin in him any longer? "He cannot sin," cries the Apostle: "he has been begotten of God"! The children of God can no more live in sin than the children of the Devil can live out of it. So that to the Christian man, in the integrity of his regenerate nature and the consciousness of his fellowship with Jesus Christ and of his filial relationship to God, sin is, in the strictest sense, a moral impossibility. Could St. John, for instance,

lie or steal? Could he hate his fellow-man, or deny the Lord that bought him? Such delinquency was inconceivable, in such a man. If an act of transgression is proposed to the child of God, however strong the inducements or fascinating the allurements it presents, he simply *cannot* do it. It is against his very nature; to commit the offence he must deny his truest self, and violate not merely his conscience and personal honour but all the instincts of the being received in his new and better birth from God.

There is, to be sure, a measure of the ideal in the Apostle's sweeping assertions on these points. His dictum in verse 9 applies in its full truth to the "perfect man" in Christ Jesus. Principle must be wrought into habit, before it has full play and sway. Ignorance and surprise will betray the unpractised Christian believer, turning aside his true purpose; through the mechanical force of old practice, or the pressure of hostile circumstance acting upon him unawares, the man who is yet weak in faith may stumble or yield ground. He is bewildered, for the moment, against his steady judgement, by some glamour of sin or sophistry of error. St. John would not count a babe in Christ, so suffering, as reprobate, nor be hasty to take that for a deadly sin which was not deliberately chosen by the man's will and did not proceed out of his heart. "There is," he writes in chap. v. 16 f., "a sin unto death"; and "there is a sin not unto death." Acts of "wrong-doing" (*ἀδικία*, v. 17) take place on the part of Christian men, which call for prayer on their behalf—prayer that will be answered by God's "giving life" to those that have so sinned. In all such instances—and charity will extend the limit of them widely—the intercession of the sinner's Advocate is hopefully invoked (ii. 1 f.). Yet the sin itself in every case, so far as its scope extends and so long as it continues, makes for death; it eclipses the soul's light of life, it involves a forfeiture of sonship, a severance of some

one or other of the bonds that unite the soul to God, a grieving of the Holy Spirit and a chilling of His fire within the breast. A new access of life must come, a deeper planting of the seed of the Spirit must be effected, if the effect of this lapse from grace is to be undone, if the man who has tripped is not to stumble on into an utter fall, but to be made through his stumbling stronger and warier for the future to run the race set before him.

Such qualifications of the great axiom of these verses the Apostle does virtually make elsewhere. They do not militate against its essential truth, nor detract from the reasonableness and consistency of St. John's doctrine of sanctification. Sin is that which has no right to be, which therefore must not be; and the Son of God has declared that it shall not be. In the true man, the offspring of God, the new man in Christ Jesus, sin has no place whatever; it is banned and barred out at every point, being the abominable thing which God hates, as it is vile in itself and ruins His creatures. Sin is against law and against nature; it is un-Christian and devilish; it blights every hope and aspiration of our being. It is disorder, and disease, and disfigurement; it is a shameful bondage, and a most miserable death. Sin is dehumanizing to ourselves, because it is the dethronement of God within us—unmanly, since it is ungodly; the perdition of the individual, and the dissolution of society. Such, in effect, is St. John's indictment of sin; and he warns and arms his readers on all sides against this one deadly mischief, which besets men from first to last in the present evil world. From sin no salvation is found save in the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord; but in His love there is a free salvation, and a salvation without limit either in duration or degree.

GEO. G. FINDLAY.

THE ORIGIN OF SACRIFICE AMONG THE SEMITES AS DEDUCED FROM FACTS GATHERED AMONG SYRIANS AND ARABS.

THIS paper is based on scores of facts collected during five summers in personal interviews with Syrians and Arabs, throughout the length and breadth of Syria, parts of Palestine and the Hauran.

The method employed is to introduce typical examples of sacrifice, and then to make an induction as to the motive for sacrifice, and finally, but briefly, to consider whether such motives may be regarded as primitive.

In the discussion of the origin of sacrifice among the Semites we must premise two factors: man, under very simple and rudimentary conditions; and a divine being suited to this man's understanding and needs in his conflict with adverse existences as they seem to him.

Ignorant man, whether Semite, African, Chinese, or South Sea Islander, has a feeling of intense need. Devastating storms, drouth, barrenness, disease, death and all other ills are directly attributed to a divine power, either to the chief god, or to one of the innumerable evil spirits. Of this fact there are numerous illustrations in the works of various modern travellers, besides my own personal observations. The world which such a man inhabits is not only peopled with men and women, but also by harmful beings, which must be overcome, or placated. Besides these there are divine beings whose aid may be invoked. These may be either progenitors of some particular tribe or clan, or independent beings. This religion is based largely on fear of harmful spirits, or on a sense of help needed from some Divine person. The offering, whatever it may be, is really the price paid for help.

In this investigation I do not at all consider the Biblical

doctrine of sacrifice, for we have to do, as it seems to me, with an earlier and a prehistoric state of religion, which we have reason to believe exists, not only among the Semites, but also among all primitive peoples, whose characteristics have been transmitted essentially unchanged to the present time.

I now give various typical examples of the occasions on which Syrians and Arabs invoke the aid of a divine being of a lower grade than God Himself.

1. A natural disaster is considered as supernatural and as wrought by an enraged weli. This affected the water supply of the town of Nebk in the Syrian Desert, inhabited by about six thousand people, including Moslems and various sects of Christians. Ever since the existence of the town, the water supply has been derived from a series of wells on a gentle incline, commencing about quarter of a mile away, each drawing water from the surrounding earth at a depth of about twelve feet, and each connecting with the next a little lower down, thus gradually forming a powerful stream. Near the mouth of the stream is the makam of the weli. A season of unusual rain comes. Three times this artificial series of fifty, or one hundred, wells is swept away, and three times it is repaired. The people, both Moslems and Christians, attribute this misfortune to the anger of the weli, because the waters flowing through the makam were rendered unclean by those bathing in them, thus defiling him; because a corpse was said to have been borne across the series of wells, thus polluting the water; and, especially, because his sacrifices had been neglected. These evils were overcome by slaughtering a number of sheep after the wells had been repaired the third time.

2. God, or some spiritual being, is held responsible for barrenness, peril in childbirth, or for what seems to be a mortal disease.

(1) A woman has no child. This is not only a deep disgrace, but the continuance of such a condition may either cause her to be put away, or may lead to the introduction of a rival wife. She does not at all think that her condition is caused by some physical disability, which might be removed by proper medical treatment, but attributes it to the ill will of a divine being, who has made her barren (cf. Gen. xvi. 2, xx. 18, xxx. 2; 1 Sam. i. 5, 6). She therefore goes to that *nebi* or *weli* that she thinks most likely to help her, and vows that if he will give her a man child, she will bring him a sheep, or goat, or some other object of value. In numerous instances, concerning which there can be no doubt, she considers him the procreator of the son that is born, for in this case she must not only pay her vow, but also induce the *weli* to waive his claim to the possession of her son.

(2) A woman seems to be in mortal peril, like the wife of Phineas (1 Sam. iv. 19, 20). Anxious relatives watch about her. Since *Mar Jirjis* in many parts of Syria is regarded as little less powerful than God, a sister finally says, "Oh, St. George, if you will bring *Maryam* through her peril, and grant her a man child, he shall be thine." A boy is born. He is called *John*. As he gets older he is told, "You belong to St. George," until finally at the age of twelve years all the family, including the aged grandmother, take him to the monastery of St. George in Northern Syria, where the *Archimandrite* cuts his hair, and his father makes payment for him in silver.

(3) An infant son lies at the point of death. This may be due to improper care. But the fond mother sees in his illness, either a visitation from God, or from some hostile being. Again, on condition of healing, a gift is promised to some *weli*; or, if it is a Moslem woman, she may vow that if the child is restored to health she will take him to a Christian church for the repugnant rite of baptism.

(4) An Arab seemingly is in mortal danger. It may have come through some exposure, and might pass away through proper medical care; but his wife, thinking it entirely due to some hostile spirit, takes their little daughter, and leading her three times around the pallet, says, "Oh, Az'abi, if you will recover my husband, when my daughter gets to be of marriageable age, I will give her to thee as a bride." The Arab recovers. When his daughter is thirteen or fourteen years of age, she is decked out as a bride, and is taken to the shrine of Az'abi, where she is given in marriage to one of his descendants.

3. God sends plague which is removed through the intervention, or intercession, of the weli.

Cholera is raging in Tiberias. Exaggerated reports reach the Arabs living on the highlands east of the lake and in other parts of the country. A tribe remembers its ancestor. They are all persuaded that they sprang from him. They have brought him sacrifices from time to time, but they have never built him a makam. In this dire visitation, of which God is the author, what friend have they but their ancestor? Supposing he should resent their neglect of him, who would intercede for them and protect them against this dread scourge? They seek therefore to win his favour. They build him a makam. Before it they slaughter sheep, sprinkling their blood on the front of it, and imploring that he will pardon their neglect.

An Arab sheik of one of the villages of the Hauran, terrified at the reports he has heard of the cholera in a town on the railroad, falls asleep. During his alternations of hope and fear, his waking thought has been of Ahmed el-Bedawi, whose shrine is near the village. He dreams. He sees the cholera advancing like an invading army. On it comes, but Ahmed el-Bedawi appears holding his long

lance, ready to hurl it against the host. They turn back in dismay. The weli assures the Arab sheik that the cholera shall not invade his village. He wakes from his sleep, tells his dream to others, and the whole village comes the next day to the makam of Ahmed el-Bedawi, bringing offerings from the flock and the threshing-floor, so as to propitiate him and keep the cholera out of the village.

4. Danger to the denizens of new tents and houses, and to mariners and passengers on new ships, averted by sacrifice.

(1) A Bedawi is about to raise a new tent—his “house of hair.” With infinite pains the Bedawiyeh has woven the long strips of black cloth on the desert sands. The tent is to be occupied for the first time, but there are other dwellers in human habitations besides men; they enter tents, caves, and new houses. They can cause the death of a beloved son, or of some other member of the family. The only recourse surely to avert such a calamity is to offer sacrifice before the new tent when it is raised for the first time, just as the Arab or Syrian dweller in the town kills a victim at the door of a new house, lest some harm should come to the inmates.

(2) In the port of Juneh, near Beirut, not to speak of other ports on the Mediterranean, a vessel is ready to be launched. But there is foul weather as well as fair. The foul weather is attributable to God (Jonah i. 4), or to some hostile power; hence a sheep is brought, its neck is placed on the prow, its throat is cut, the blood flows into the water. The body is either cast into the sea or given to the poor. In either case it is an offering to Mar Jirjis, who is especially present with mariners.

5. Sacrifice to a tribal god on going into battle by the Arabs.

The Rualla, a division of the Aeneze, is on the eve of

battle. On the morrow it is to make a raid on another tribe, in the hope of rich booty in the addition of hundreds of camels to its great herds. But a religious service must first take place. The representative of the tribe that goes into battle is the sheik's daughter or sister, adorned to make herself as lovely as possible in the eyes of all the warriors of the tribe. She is seated on a camel under a canopy. But that camel has been sprinkled with sacrificial blood, an offering to Abu Dahur, the progenitor of the tribe, in order that he may go before them and fight for them.

6. Sacrifices for the safety of pilgrims.

Travellers are setting out on a journey through the desert. There are the perils from lack of water, from marauding bands, who lie in wait for travellers. It is a grave undertaking, of which no one can guess the issue. He goes therefore to his makam and promises the weli that if he will give him a safe conduct he will bring him a sacrifice. On his arrival the promise is paid.

We have now to make an induction as to the typical cases mentioned with reference to the origin of sacrifice. In making it we are to recall that all calamity is attributable to some supernatural power; either to God Himself, or to some evil spirit, remembering that, so far as my observation goes, people go to the makam to get help. There can be but three means of relief from the evil which threatens man: either to induce God or the evil spirit to change his mind, or to overcome the hostile spirit. This work is entirely committed to the nebis or welis. They are always the ones to whom the Arab or Syrian goes in his trouble, and upon whom he relies for relieving him from it. This relief may come either through the intercession of these beings, or through their own act.

Let us pass the examples cited in review.

1. A weli attempts to destroy the water-supply of a large

town. The successful execution of this plan, which is announced by a threefold flood, would mean the wiping out of a large and prosperous community. The inhabitants seek to placate him and satisfy his wounded honour by offering sacrifices. Here there can be no other motive than the commercial one. The people in effect say to the weli, whose makam is near the outflow of the water system, "We cut the throats of these sheep in payment of our past neglect, and of any indignity that has been done you."

2. An unfriendly power keeps a woman from bearing, or when she has come to the birth-hour, threatens to take away her own life or that of the child, or tries to rob a mother of a son, or seeks to deprive the Bedawiyeh of her husband. In each case a bargain is made with the weli, either a sheep, or money, or a girl is given as the price. The weli is to do something, and in consideration of what he does is to get something.

3. God threatens cholera. The weli is trusted to see that the cholera does not come, and is paid for his services in keeping it away.

4. Dangers to inhabitants of new dwellings, or mariners and passengers on ships. The danger is considered so real that in numerous sections of the country, in the desert, and at various ports of the Mediterranean sacrifices are offered. These may be considered as a premium paid on an insurance policy, which protects the lives of the people from the afrit, or from divine visitation.

5. Sacrifices to the god of war. There is no other object than to secure his aid in battle. The sacrifice is nothing else than the price paid to guarantee his aid in fighting against the enemy.

6. The offering given the weli for the safe conduct on the journey, much on the same principle that a traveller gives a megidie a day to the mounted soldier who has guarded him safely through a dangerous part of the country.

We may now ask the question, whether this idea of payment for services rendered appertains to the origin of sacrifice among the Semites. It certainly seems to be characteristic of the sacrifices described, and is a simple conception suited to a low stage of intelligence. The primitive man feels he cannot exist without the help of a higher power, and that he can secure that help through a gift. What that gift is, whether it is a human life, as among some savage tribes, or whether the animal slain is a substitute for a human life, does not appertain to the discussion of this subject, which is simply: Why does the Semite offer sacrifice now? Could his progenitor have had any more child-like motive than the Syrian or Arab to-day?

The answer cannot be one of certainty, but it seems to me both to be one of great probability, and emphatically affirmative. If our picture of primitive man as feeling that he is surrounded by adverse forces is correct, and he believes in a higher power, or departed ancestor, one of the simplest conceptions is to get the aid of that being. Even under the most rudimentary conditions of society something is not secured for nothing. It must be paid for.

It is here that examples from the religions of other peoples, some of whom are in a state of savagery, may prove of service. I do not claim to have made any exhaustive study of the subject, though I have read books on comparative religion; I merely give examples which were not sought to support any theory, which came to me mostly in the library of Dr. Wright of Nablus, who was for ten years missionary in Africa; and from two volumes, not yet published, by a fellow-traveller on the Mediterranean, Mr. W. E. Geil, who has travelled almost continually during the past four years in the South Sea Islands, in China, and in Africa. He has recorded what he has seen and heard, without at all recognizing its significance for this discussion.

It will be seen that these examples are finely illustrative of the subject under discussion. I also quote once each from Stanley and from Rev. J. K. Giffen, a missionary in the Sudan, grouping all the quotations under six heads :

1. Hostile powers who must be propitiated. Stanley, who, as we have seen, thought the Wahuma of Africa had no religion, says : " They believe most thoroughly in the existence of an evil influence in the form of a man, who exists in uninhabited places as a wooded darksome gorge, or large extent of reedy brake, but that he can be propitiated by gifts ; therefore the lucky hunter leaves a portion of the meat, which he tosses, however, as he would to a dog, or he places an egg, or a small banana, or a kid-skin, at the door of the miniature dwelling which is always found at the entrance to the zeiba." There are the following parallelisms between this example and simple Semitic religion : fear of a hostile power who must be placated by a bit of meat, or by leaving a present at what seems to be the makam, about which we read elsewhere.

Geil, in his *Yankee on the Yangtze*, says : " The Kachin is most superstitious. He believes in one great spirit, the creator of all things. . . . He . . . upholds and sustains all things, and is benevolent ; but has withdrawn himself to the spirit land and does not care for the Kachins, so they need not concern themselves about him. . . . All the other spirits are malicious, and are feared by the Kachins, especially those of thunder and lightning. All the sacrifices are made through fear and gratitude." Here, as among the Syrians, is the common idea that God is so far away as to be of no practical significance for life, and the gift made, by inference, to the evil spirit. Obviously in this and every one of the following examples as to the religion of a given country there has been a failure to ask most important questions.

2. Departed kings in Africa honoured by human sacrifices.

Dr. Wright reports that the kings of Uganda are worshipped after death. They believe in a Great Spirit, who inhabits the Victoria Nyanza. In connexion with spirit-worship, they worship the spirit of the departed king. They go to the king's tomb. . . . There is a house over him. The king's palace becomes his shrine. . . . They offer human sacrifices from time to time. Here again there is the one Great Spirit, and the worship of the departed king, as of the departed sheik, among the Arabs, though only a few have this honour; here, too, is something corresponding to a makam, and here is human sacrifice, or the gift of personality which we shall observe more than once, and which there is some reason for believing was the earliest form of bloody sacrifice among the Semites.

3. Welfare of flocks, herds and fields secured through sacrifice. The belief of the Sudanese is summed up by Rev. J. K. Giffen as follows: "They believe in a great God, creator of all things, and in a demi-god or prophet, who under the great creator controls every event for good or evil. They do not seem directly to offer worship to the Great Creator, or to have any responsibility to him, but rather to the demi-god, or prophet, who is called Nik-kanga. . . . There is a line of priests, descendants of the Nik-kanga, who sacrifice the victim. . . . This sacrifice, in their belief, has some influence on the amount of rain, the growth of their flocks and the prosperity of their flocks and herds." This quotation is in the line of the others, only, as so often among the Syrians, the priestly family is descended from the national god, who is distinguished from the Creator.

4. Sacrifices for houses and vessels. In the South Sea Islands, "when a chief's house was in the course of erection, where the posts were to be set large holes were dug, and a live man stood in each, clasping the post in his arms, while the earth was cast in about them, burying the poor fellows alive." These human sacrifices were believed to give per-

manency to the house. In another of the South Sea Islands the doorposts are regarded as sacred because each was resting on a human sacrifice. "On the eve of the New Year in the province of Sueshwan in western China they sacrifice a cock directly before the front door of each dwelling, and sprinkle the blood on the sill to keep out the evil spirit."

The following instance of a sacrifice in connexion with the launching of ships is given, as also found in one of the South Sea Islands: "When a canoe of a big chief was launched, live bodies were used for rollers, and the awful groans and cries were overwhelmed by the gleeful shouts of the launchers."

One more illustration must suffice: "Among the necessary preliminaries to starting on a boat of this kind (i.e. the red lifeboat), the Chinese usually kill a cock and smear the blood and feathers on the bow of the boat."

These examples of sacrifice for boats and houses are most instructive, when taken in comparison with those in Syria. We may well ask again, in passing, whether human sacrifices do not present a more primitive stage than the sacrifices of fowls or animals?

From the four classes of examples, which came to me unsought in this connexion, it seems to me we have illustrations of similar features to those found in Semitic religion. This similarity has in no sense been produced by contiguity, for the examples are taken from China, Africa and the South Seas, but represents, as it seems to me, most ancient ideas in every part of the world, of man's need, of the dangers to which he is exposed, and of the aid which he seeks from a divine being, who may not represent the highest power, and who must either be propitiated or must propitiate some one else. To this being the Syrian, Arab, African, Chinaman, or South Sea Islander presents his gift for services rendered. This seems to be the primitive idea

of sacrifice, from which all the other more complex ideas, such as vicarious sacrifice, and the sacrificial meal, of which I have found the faintest if any traces, have been evolved. Vows and sacrifices, or promises to pay, and exact payment at the shrines among Moslems and Christians, survive to-day as a tremendous force in the religion of Syria, as I have sought to prove in a previous paper.

My only desire is that I might present in all their force the array of facts I have gathered up in my journals during seven years of research in the Orient, and that I might make others feel the power of that persuasion that comes from living and moving during all these years in a constantly enlarging domain of impressions, as well as facts. Direct and indirect evidence seems to converge toward the persuasion that we may still recognize, in outline, though not in detail, a religion which we may call, for lack of a better term, pre-historic or primitive. If this be so, we should also be able to recognize the origin of sacrifice.

SAMUEL IVES CURTISS.

INDEX.

	PAGE
Rev. Professor B. W. Bacon, D.D.	
The "Coming One" of John the Baptist	1
Rev. Professor W. E. Barnes, D.D.	
A Messianic Prophecy	376
Rev. Professor J. Agar Beet, D.D.	
The Revised Version of the New Testament: a Reply	364
Rev. Professor W. H. Bennett, D.D., Litt.D.	
The Life of Christ according to St. Mark	18, 220, 302
Rev. Arthur Carr, M.A.	
A Foreshadowing of Christian Martyrdom	294
Late Rev. Professor Samuel Ives Curtiss, D.D.	
The Origin of Sacrifice among the Semites as Deduced from Facts Gathered among Syrians and Arabs	461
Rev. Professor S. R. Driver, D.D.	
Translations from the Prophets: Jeremiah xlvi. 1-xlvii. 28	61
" " " " xlvii. 29-xlix.	138
Rev. Alex. R. Eagar, D.D.	
The Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews	74, 110
Rev. Professor G. G. Findlay, D.D.	
Studies in the First Epistle of John :	
3. The Old and New Commandment	30
4. The Filial Character and Hope	149, 175
5. The Inadmissibility of Sin	313, 451
Rev. Professor A. E. Garvie, M.A., D.D.	
Conscience and Creed	202
Rev. Professor Buchanan Gray, D.D.	
The View from Mount Nebo	321
Rev. Professor H. R. Mackintosh, Ph.D.	
Dogmatic Theology: Its Nature and Function	413
Rev. J. H. Dudley Matthews, M.A.	
Spiritual Healing	135
Rev. Professor D. S. Margoliouth, M.A.	
The Permanent Elements of Religion	230, 260
The Historical Character of Jesus of Nazareth	401
Rev. J. B. Mayor, M.A., Litt.D.	
Notes on the Text of the Second Epistle of Peter	284
Rev. J. B. McClellan, M.A.	
The Revised Version of the New Testament: a Plea for Hesitation as to its Adoption	187
Rev. James Moffatt, D.D.	
Loisy upon the Sermon on the Mount	97
Literary Illustrations of Ecclesiastes	388, 432
Rev. Professor J. H. Moulton, M.A., Litt.D.	
Characteristics of New Testament Greek 124, 168, 276, 353, 440	

	PAGE
Professor W. M. Ramsay, D.C.L., LL.D.	
The Letter to the Church in Thyatira	37
The Letter to the Church in Sardis	81, 161
The Flavian Persecution in the Province of Asia	241
The Letter to the Church in Philadelphia.	342

INDEX TO TEXTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
Genesis iv. 24	170	Ecclesiastes x. 20	437
xvi. 2	463	xi. 1, 2	437
Exodus xxiii. 20-23.	10	4	438
xxxii. 1	447	8	439
xxxiv. 29-35	195, 371	Isaiah i. 23	148
Numbers xiv. 43	341	x. 12	382
xxi. 21-31	340	xv. 5	140
xxvii. 12	325	xvi. 6	138
Deuteronomy iii. 23-29	325	9	139
iii. 27	328	xxii. 12	382
xi. 24	328	xxxii. 14, 16	381
xiii. 16	142	xxxv. 5-6	16
xxxii. 48	325	liii. 5	448
49	322	lxiii. 5	7
xxxiv. 1	323	Jeremiah xvii. 8	146
1-6	326	xxxi. 31	373
3	328	xlv.-xlviii.	61
Joshua xiii. 14-28	142	xlvi. 3-13	62
Judges ix. 53	357	14-23	64
1 Samuel iv. 19-20	463	24-28	66
xxxi. 8	199	xlvii. 1-5	67
2 Kings iii. 25	140	xlviii. 1-7	69
xvii. 9	148	8-22	70
Job xxiii. 13	142	xlviii.-xlix.	138
xxiv. 12	277	xlix. 1-9	142
Psalms viii. 6	192	10-22	144
Proverbs ix. 12	278	23-33	146
xxvii. 15	277	Amos i. 14	142
Ecclesiastes i. 1	388	vii. 1, 4, 7	340
9, 11.	390	viii. 1	340
12	391	ix. 11	377
14	392	11-15	7
ii. 10-11	391	Micah iv. 8	376
11	393	9-10	377
17, 22	393	11-13	381
iii. 2	393	v. 1-6	382
4, 8, 11	394	Malachi i. 1	10
iv. 1-12	395	iii. 1	227
v. 2-13	396	Matthew i. 21	124
vi. 8-9	397	ii. 10	361
vii. 2-10	399	23	407
15-23	432	iii. 7-12	5
28, 29	433	iv. 8	340
viii. 8-11	433	v. 9	179
ix. 1-10	434	11	180
11, 14, 15	436	17-24	102
x. 6, 7, 13	436	20	176

	PAGE		PAGE
Matthew v. 22	101	Luke xii. 35	155
39	99	xiv. 18	280
vi. 28	362	xvi. 16	8
vii. 1	107	xvii. 8	283
3	362	xviii. 19	175
24-27	103	xix. 29	124
ix. 1	279	xx. 23	362
27	297	36	113
xiii. 30	169	John i. 6	125
xv. 32	125	10	154
xvi. 13-20	3	11	356
xvii. 21	372	14	172
xviii. 22	170	15	133
xx. 23	106	19-37	1
xxiii. 33	360	21	17
xxv. 16	361	29	320
34	179	42	279
xxvi. 2	441	45	407
50	282	iii. 22-30	1
xxvii. 21	132	iv. 25	9
24	280	vi. 25	449
xxviii. 20	154	vii. 27	408
Mark i. 2	227	viii. 19	150
7, 8	1	ix.	294
8	14	x. 24	300
36	361	xi. 12	136
ii. 1	171	xii. 1	130
iii. 16	124	9	173
v. 7	5	26	185
vi. 13	136	40	362
14-16	16	xiii. 35	32
15	23	xiv. 7	181
vii. 21	445	15	175
24-37	18	xv. 1-7	369
viii. 2	125	6	445
22-26	18	xvii. 3	358
viii. 27-ix. 1	22	23, 26	33
38	179	25	358
ix. 2-10	11	xviii. 34	277
2-13	220	xxi. 22	155
14-29	227	23	359
30-50	302	Acts ii. 8	278
38	442	iii. 26	17
x. 1-31	305	iv. 23	280
36	449	x. 36	190
xiv. 10	169	xi. 16	14
18	356	28	281
Luke i. 20	281	xiii. 7	113
ii. 4	280	9	455
iv. 5	340	22	126
10	361	xiv. 22	294
34	407	xv. 16	377
vi. 20-23	102	28	48
41	279	36	366
vii. 19	3	xviii. 24-xix. 7	1
32	171	xix. 2	14
viii. 42	358	16	134
xi. 5-8	109	xx. 28	280

	PAGE		PAGE
Acts xxiii. 27	362	Galatians iii. 2	362
xxiv. 24	277	27	199
xxv. 13	444	v. 14	277
xxvi. 5	132	16	362
xxvii. 1	124	17	369
39	362	Ephesians i. 4, 5	178
Romans i. 3	410	ii. 16	31
20	361	iii. 4	362
ii. 14	176	iv. 25	366
iii. 9	188, 193	Philippians iii. 9	367
v. 1	190, 355	iv. 2	45
1	365	Colossians i. 15	198
4	356	i. 18	113
5	177	ii. 8	268
11	450	15	198, 198
vi. 13	443	15	370, 374
vii. 7, 8	369	iv. 3	344
viii. 19	179, 313	1 Thessalonians iv. 15	153
37	193	16	184
xi. 22	177	v. 15	99
xiii. 9	277	2 Thessalonians iii. 17	75
14	199	2 Timothy ii. 19	358
xiv. 5	279	Hebrews i. 3	198
17	100	5	113
xvi. 7	446	ii. 17	182
1 Corinthians i. 18	372	iii. 12	128
ii. 8	180	v. 5	376
iv. 12	99	vii. 8	359
v. 10	57, 161	ix. 12	444
vi. 1	99	26	319
15	366	33	361
vii. 2	278	37	118
5	372	xii. 3	137
viii. 6	368	7	172
x. 29	276	James i. 11	445
xiii. 12	358	v. 14 15	135
xv. 4	445	1 Peter i. 18	173
22	359	iii. 1	280
24	5	2 Peter i. 1-4	284
27	370	12, 17	285
31	359	19, 21	286
49	191	ii. 1	56
51	153, 182	4	286
53-4	199	11-13	289
xvi. 5	441	15-18	290
2 Corinthians ii. 12	344	iii. 6-10	291
13, 14	192	11-16	292
iii. 5	373	1 John ii. 2-7	451
18	194, 371	28-iii. 3	149
v. 10	156	Revelation i. 12	154
15	81	x. 10	356
vi. 7	191	xi. 3-13	12
ke 9	359	18	362
xi. 2	186	xiv. 13	359
xv. 27	192	xix. 9	179

